

## DEMobilIZATION OF AMERICAN TROOPS.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday in discussing the subject of demobilization some question was raised as to the attitude of the administration. I had not at the time I made my remarks seen the Washington Times newspaper of January 14. I have it before me now, and I will read this extract from it:

PRESIDENT TELLS PEACE DELEGATES AMERICAN TROOPS MUST GO HOME—ALLIES' PLAN TO KEEP YANKS AS POLICEMEN IS OPPOSED.

PARIS, January 14.

The outstanding feature of the allied peace conferences to-day was the announcement by President Wilson to the delegates that American troops must be sent home from Europe without delay.

It is learned that the imperativeness of returning the Yanks to the United States as quickly as possible was strongly emphasized by the President, who wants the fighters to be enabled to resume normal peace-time occupations at the earliest possible moment.

I am delighted to know that the President's views on this subject and mine seem to be apparently the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that that is just a part of some of the recent expressions of the President of the United States and not an expression of his entire purpose.

## RECESS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas that a recess be taken until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 15, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Come Thou, Almighty Father, with all Thy power and holy influence, and help us and all the world to extricate ourselves from the tangled web which we have woven about us.

The war presumably is over and we are striving to reconstruct the world into a permanent peace. Remind us, we beseech Thee, that reconstruction begins at home.

Help us to look into our own hearts with a view of reconstructing ourselves. Thou hast made clear the way, but we are strangely forgetful and fail to follow the straight and narrow way, which is life eternal.

Give us the will, the determination, to cast out satan, which is selfishness, and follow the golden rule, the panacea for all the ills that beset us, and the world will reconstruct itself. Peace will be permanent and every home, every nation, will enjoy the fruits of their own labors and the world become a paradise. In Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOWERS (at the request of Mr. COOPER of West Virginia), for one week on account of illness.

To Mr. LUNDEEN, for six days on account of illness.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

S. 5318. An act granting a pension to Edith Carow Roosevelt.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 5318. An act granting a pension to Edith Carow Roosevelt; to the Committee on Pensions.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon the question of the zone postal law, including therein a letter written by me to Mr. Charles Johnson Post, director of the publishers' advisory board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who do I understand wrote the letter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a letter from myself to Mr. Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a letter from Simon W. Rosendale in opposition to Zionism.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter therein from Dr. Rosendale against Zionism. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## SESSION CLERKS TO VARIOUS COMMITTEES.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I present herewith a privileged report from the Committee on Accounts, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 460.

Resolved, That clerks to committees of the House during the session provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, be, and they are hereby, assigned for the present session of Congress to the following committees, to wit: Committee on Education, Committee on Railways and Canals, Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, Committee on Invalid Pensions (assistant clerk), Committee on the Judiciary (additional assistant clerk), Committee on Enrolled Bills (assistant clerk), Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

With the following amendments:

Strike out all of lines 7 and 8; in line 11 strike out the words "committee on disposition"; strike out all of line 12; after the words "assistant clerk," in line 11, insert the words "Committee on Woman Suffrage," so that the resolution as amended will read as follows:

Resolved, That clerks to committees of the House during the session provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, be, and they are hereby, assigned for the present session of Congress to the following committees, to wit: Committee on Education, Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, Committee on Invalid Pensions (assistant clerk), Committee on Enrolled Bills (assistant clerk), Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Woman Suffrage."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. Certainly.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that a few days ago the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] reported this and the resolution that I assume will be taken up next in order, and at that time I opposed the resolution and asked the gentleman to withdraw it upon the ground that through an error I had not been notified of the meeting of the committee. The committee has now met and has gone with some care into each one of these questions. As a result of our deliberations, and after hearing the chairmen of the several committees, we have stricken out the Committee on Railways and Canals, the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic, and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service from this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. And we have added the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. SANFORD. And have added the Committee on Woman Suffrage. In the other resolution we have stricken out about half of the committees. I would not have the House for a moment think that this is wholly a satisfactory method of dealing with this kind of business, but so far as I have been able to see we have taken the only course that is open to us. I have stood for the proposition that any person who asks from this Committee on Accounts for the disbursement of public money should come before the committee and tell his reason. With reference to this particular question I have asked that the chairman shall first say to this committee that in his judgment the proposition calls for a wise disbursement of public money, and that he favors it, and then I have required that he give some reasons to substantiate his judgment. I have not seen fit to go any further than that. The committees that have been stricken from both of these resolutions are the committees where the chairmen have not been able to make that statement.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Gladly.

Mr. MANN. How has the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service been provided with a clerk until now?

Mr. SANFORD. That is not in this resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is not provided except that we provide for it in this resolution.

Mr. MANN. I thought it was proposed to strike that out.

Mr. HASTINGS. That would leave that committee without any clerk at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the revised form the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service is provided with a clerk.

Mr. SANFORD. My memorandum is that the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service is provided with a clerk.

Mr. HASTINGS. We strike out the Committee on Railways and Canals and the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic and substitute the Committee on Woman Suffrage and the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman from New York to say that they had taken out the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. SANFORD. In saying so I think I followed a prompting that was made to me, but my memorandum shows that the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service is taken care of in this resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am informed by a member of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service that it has not met during this entire Congress. What is the need of providing for a clerk in the closing days, except, perhaps, to wind up the business of that important committee?

The SPEAKER. The Civil Service Committee is in the amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. I am unable to answer that question. My position is this: If the chairman of a committee, of a standing committee of this House, comes before our committee and says that, in his judgment, the public work that is intrusted to him can not be done without this assistance and then gives the reasons, I feel that, as a Member of the House, I am bound by his judgment, because the functions that, under the rules, are placed on these several committees are vital and important functions. I know that in many cases the functions are not performed. I know that in a majority of the cases these committees on expenditures do not do any work at all, but in some cases they do do work. In any event, they have very important duties.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SANFORD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Take, for instance, the once very important Committee on Woman Suffrage. We have passed all the legislation possible that can be conceived on that question, and now we are asked by a gentleman, who is a very busy Member of this Congress, for a committee clerk. What is the reason advanced by the chairman of that committee that he should desire the aid of a clerk in these closing days of the term?

Mr. SANFORD. I would like to have the gentleman know that I struggled very patiently and tried to persuade the chairman of the Committee on Woman Suffrage that the work of that committee was long since done. I opposed this provision, but the chairman of the committee was very serious and said that his correspondence was very extensive, and that the work before it is very vital. I could not quite understand it, but he was a very responsible person intrusted with a very responsible position, and I felt in his case that I was bound by his judgment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I will.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I wish to call the attention of the gentlemen of the House to the fact that at the time the Woman Suffrage Committee was created, and in the hearings at that time of the creation, it was agreed by those who were interested or promised by those who were interested in the creation of that committee that when the legislation had passed the House there would be no longer need of the Committee on Woman Suffrage, and it would not be longer continued.

Mr. SANFORD. And that situation is with the House. It is for the House to decide, but it is my opinion that we should no more have that committee than a committee on men suffrage. I am very glad to see anybody who is enthusiastic to help the women of the country along, but to have a committee of this kind on woman suffrage when it has wound up all it can do is ridiculous, but it exists by virtue of the judgment and action of the House.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. Does this provide for a clerk to this committee for the term of six or eight weeks?

Mr. SANFORD. In this resolution.

Mr. GILLET. It is not to July 1?

Mr. SANFORD. No.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to say on behalf of the Committee on Accounts that the chairman of these several committees appeared before the committee and made statements. Now, in reference to this Committee on Woman Suffrage I do not think there is any more important committee of the House. It is a very live question throughout the United States and throughout

the several States. The chairman of the committee appeared before us and stated that a vast amount of correspondence is before that committee upon this subject, and I am sure that Members of Congress understand that this being a live subject that there is a vast amount of correspondence coming, of course, to the committee and that a clerk to the committee is needed. It is only a session clerk and expires with the end of this Congress on the 4th of March next, and the committee, after hearing the statement made by the chairman, agreed favorably to report this resolution with this amendment, and we believe it ought to pass.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I will.

Mr. GARD. I have a very high regard for the gentleman's work on this somewhat troublesome committee and also for his candid and impartial expression of his views. Will the gentleman state whether in his opinion any of these clerkships are needed at this session in either of these resolutions?

Mr. SANFORD. In answer to the gentleman I should like to say I have very great doubt whether any of them are needed at all or not, but I have felt that the Committee on Accounts is bound by the judgment of the men who have duties imposed upon them under the rules of the House, and that if they come before us and tell us that those duties can not be performed without a clerk I feel I am bound by their judgment. The one thing which I want to impress, however, with reference to this at this time is this, that I felt and feel now that the House should protect this committee to the extent of supporting it in striking out these committees where the chairman is not able to come and make a statement. I want to see the House get a little confidence in the method by which the committee is now proceeding.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANFORD. I will.

Mr. GARNER. I am very anxious the House should get more confidence in the Committee on Accounts myself, but I think the method the gentleman has adopted, and he is very frank with the House, will cause them to lose some confidence in it; that if you simply go and take the statement of a man about the need of a clerk, and you are not going to investigate yourself and ascertain definite knowledge of whether he needs the clerk, I am afraid you will not have the confidence of the House which you ought to have.

Mr. SANFORD. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] misunderstands my statement. I say that I want the House to have confidence in the method of exclusion which I have adopted. I do not care whether the House adopts the resolution for any of these committees or not; but I say the thing we are doing now is so much better than anything we have done before that I think the House ought not to put in this resolution any provision in favor of any man who has not the courage to come or has not seen the necessity of coming and stating the facts on which he makes his claim.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand from the statement of the gentleman and the gentleman proposing the resolution that it was the intention of the committee to provide merely session clerks for these committees?

Mr. SANFORD. Under the pending resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SANFORD. This resolution assigns to certain committees the clerks provided for in the legislative bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Ah, will the gentleman permit me? There are no clerks provided for this committee in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1919. The gentleman is under an error in so proceeding. There is no clerk provided for the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Mr. SANFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. GARNER. There are some clerks provided for.

Mr. SANFORD. I say that the legislative bill provides a certain number of clerks, to the number of eight. The legislative bill provides for eight clerks without assigning them to any definite committees.

Mr. GARNER. And you are undertaking to assign them here?

Mr. SANFORD. It is the function of the Accounts Committee to assign them to certain committees.

Mr. SNELL. Is there any evidence to show about the clerk for the Committee on Railways and Canals?

Mr. SANFORD. That was stricken out.

Mr. SNELL. I was on that committee two years, and I never found the door open. I wondered what they did.

Mr. SANFORD. That explains the situation. I do feel that I would like to relieve my own conscience by saying to the House about this subject that I have found, from day to day and from week to week in the work of this committee, hidden under the cloak of this sort of legislation and this sort of procedure lots



of things that I would not want to talk about in public—things I know the House would not stand for. When conditions of this kind exist men act as they would not act if they were really confronted with the nature of the thing they were doing. I have found that these different authorities for the creation of patronage are used for private and political gain of one kind and another. There is none of it very important, because there is none of it big. It is all little. But little as it is, it seems to enter into the relationships in the House and poison them and contaminate them. I think we can cure this situation to some extent if we will simply insist that men talk about the thing they want to do; tell the thing they want to do.

I have found, for instance, under all the old precedents here that some of these committee clerkships have been taken and given to individual Members of the House who were not on the committees at all; that is, a gentleman getting the right to appoint a clerk under one of these resolutions at \$6 a day takes that clerkship and gives it under the direction of some person of authority to some other person, because persons in authority want to reward or help that other person. Now, that is absolutely unjustifiable. That thing has been done under circumstances where it would seem on the surface as if it were done to influence important and vital action in this House. It is done by persons of influence and authority, who perhaps at the time they did it did not understand, perhaps did not give consideration enough to it to realize, the enormity and the moral turpitude of the thing they were doing. These clerkships have been assigned to individual Members for their private and personal use, when no person would have had the temerity to say publicly or to say in the House that there ever was such intention. On the other hand, in this House to-day there are men who by reason of their prominence in national legislation have been confronted with great tasks to perform, and who by reason of their position on this committee or that committee are carrying great burdens, and because of that the business they have to do in their offices has so greatly increased that they are unable to cope with the situation, and they are hiring clerks out of their own pockets. I sometimes think that the House, if it knew the situation with reference to some of these very prominent and capable and busy Members of the House, might be inclined to help the situation out. But I am sure the House would never intentionally authorize the practices that have prevailed in the distribution of patronage.

When I first came on the committee, the committee acted wholly on precedent. It would be said, "There is precedent for this thing; this thing has been done for 20 years"; and if anybody would say that this thing had always been done it would go. And that is where the danger was. Precedent never justifies the expenditure of money. And however little this thing is apparently on its face, because these resolutions only involve a couple of thousands of dollars a month, nevertheless I am anxious to persuade the House to this point of view for the reasons I have indicated.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] five minutes. How much time have I?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman started in with an hour and has used 20 minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have taken seriously the appointment of myself on various committees. I believe there are important duties to be performed, and I have attempted to perform them. The only criticism I have received is that I am too active and have asked for too much here and there.

I thought when a man was appointed on a committee it was his duty to do the work of that committee, and the duty of the House to furnish the committee with the necessary clerical assistance and material with which to do the work. The House graciously appointed me on the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, and I acted as chairman for six months. I was given no secretary and was told by the House that I should do no work. Notwithstanding that, I gathered a lot of data and information in order that I might judiciously perform my duties as chairman if I was continued upon that committee. There was work that the House ought to have had done. That committee has important functions to perform, as do all of the committees on expenditures in the various departments if they would but do their duty to the House and the country. They could be busy two-thirds of the time, particularly when the Members are not members of other committees. On the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice in particular they should look into the question of the expenditures of that department and its various agents as to what has been done regarding the expenditures in the various penitentiaries, the expenditures of United States clerks of courts, district attorneys, and marshals. The

duty of that committee is to take that work up, and I was trying to do that.

Now, when the House determined upon a Committee on Woman Suffrage and I was again given an honor—and I take it to be an honor to be the chairman of that committee—I took up the responsibility of that committee, not only to the House but to the country, and I have tried to do my work and have the committee do its work. We have been doing work—active work—and when a bill is passed through the House that fact is no sign that it is the duty of the committee to cease its work. It is the duty of the committee to push it along and see that it is enacted, if it can get through, if it is proper legislation. There is hardly a day when the secretary of that committee is not at work on correspondence and in personal communication, by telephone and otherwise, with those who favor a constitutional amendment giving the right of suffrage to women.

This committee authorized me to employ a clerk—the same one we had before—and a meeting has been called for Monday, and a hearing is to be had, and I deem it my duty to see to it that the things that belong to that committee are attended to. Merely because some one is opposed to woman suffrage is to me no reason why I should cease to do my work. When we are fighting for democracy abroad and spending over \$35,000,000,000 we at home are refusing to extend the same right of democracy to over half of our population, who are begging and pleading for it. The members of the committee are ready and willing to give their time and perform their duty and see to it that the committee is called together, and no member on that committee can say that committee meetings have not been called or that the clerk has not been attentive and is not necessary. I do not believe that we should ask the House to do something that does not belong to proper legislative functions. There are some committees that have a great deal of work to do; and if those who have charge of them would not try to gather before their committees all the important functions that belong to other committees less important those other committees will perform the duties that are placed upon them. If they will do it, they will have their hands full. They have got the chance to have their secretary and their experts do the work that they ought to do.

It is one of the things that this House attempted to do eight years ago, and it is one of the things that you Republicans will attempt to do when the Democrats have turned over the administration of this House to you. You will make an investigation of the executive departments. But you should make an investigation now by your Democratic committees, and let them go to work; and if anything wrong is shown up you can bring in legislation to correct it and not wait until two years from now. Do your duty as it is done now in every county and State in this Union, where they examine into the facts to see whether the public money is properly expended, and enforce the law and see that it is properly expended, and if a correction is to be made, make the correction. Because a man comes here for a year or two and gets on a small committee is that any reason why he should quit and lie down and do nothing?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to have two or three minutes more.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. RAKER. I realize that we are taking up the time of the Committee on Appropriations. But yesterday we agreed to dispense with the proceedings in order to-day, and we have done that for a month, putting aside Calendar Wednesday and other matters. I do not want to take up the time of the House unduly, but I believe it is unfair and unjust to criticize small committees because they are trying to do their duty and perform their work. I think it is unfair to criticize a man and try to belittle him because he is on a small committee and not on the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs. That ought not to be the spirit of any man in this House. A man if he is on a small committee to-day, if he is attending to his duties and giving proper service to the House and to his constituency, will be appreciated by his constituency and he will be enabled to demonstrate that he is worthy of going on further. That has been the history of this country for a hundred years, and will continue to be the history of this country until the end. [Applause.]

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on the amendment. I move the previous question.

Mr. LITTLE. Can I have two minutes?

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman can speak on the next resolution.

Mr. LITTLE. Will not the gentleman yield me just two minutes?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. I just want to say this: I am on that committee, and I see in this list three committees, all of which put together do not do as much work as is done by this single Committee on Woman Suffrage. I think the House ought to be fair with us. Those people receive a stack of correspondence that will keep a clerk busy from now until the 4th of March. The young lady who is acting as clerk has been doing the work of that committee since November, and she should be paid for it, and the people in the country who write about this woman-suffrage amendment to the Constitution should have answers given to their letters. What subject before Congress is more worthy of consideration than this? I think this committee should have a clerk and the clerk should be paid like other clerks of committees. It is an important committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let the amendment be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 460, as it will read when amended:

"Resolved, That clerks to committees of the House during the session provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, be, and they are hereby, assigned for the present session of Congress to the following committees, to wit: Committee on Education; Committee on Reform in the Civil Service; Committee on Invalid Pensions, assistant clerk; Committee on the Judiciary, additional assistant clerk; Committee on Enrolled Bills, assistant clerk; Committee on Woman Suffrage."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOOHER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

#### SESSION CLERKS TO VARIOUS COMMITTEES.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I send up another privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose, provided he will agree that if there is a row about it he will withdraw the resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. I will. I promised the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] that I would do so.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House resolution 468.

"Resolved, That the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of the Interior, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor, the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department, the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department, the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds each be allowed a clerk at the rate of \$125 per month during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning December 2, 1918; that the Committee on Enrolled Bills be allowed a clerk, at the rate of \$6 per diem, during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning the 2d day of December, 1918; that the Committee on Rules be allowed an assistant clerk, at the rate of \$100 per month, during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning the 2d day of December, 1918. Salaries of said clerks to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. HASTINGS. There is an amendment contained in the report eliminating a number of these committees.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Accounts report the following substitute resolution:

"Resolved, That there be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for the services of a clerk to each of the committees designated herein compensation at the rate of \$125 per month during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning December 2, 1918: Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Labor, Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department; that the Committee on Rules be allowed an assistant clerk, at the rate of \$100 per month, during the third session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, beginning on the 2d day of December, 1918."

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. CALDWELL. The Committees on Expenditures in the War and Navy Departments were purposely left out, were they?

Mr. HASTINGS. They were purposely left out. The chairmen of these several committees were sent for, and the chairmen of these two committees did not appear. We allowed clerks only where representatives of the committees appeared before the Committee on Accounts and where, after investigation, the Committee on Accounts found that there were bills or other matters pending before the committees that justified the allowance of clerks.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAMLIN. I notice that in the amendment offered the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department is left out. The chairman of that committee did not appear before the Committee on Accounts. I am not certain that he was requested to appear, but at any rate he would not have appeared, for the reason that that committee does not expect to have any meetings during this session. I am not complaining. I care nothing about it. I only want to say this: That this committee was provided for in 1812. During all the time that the Republicans were in charge of this House, I think without exception, that committee was awarded a clerk at each session of the Congress, and the record shows that during all of that time, under a Republican administration, it met only a few times about the year 1876. Since the Democratic Party has been in control of the House that committee has done considerable work, covering many weeks' time, and have saved the Government enough money to pay the salary of a clerk for the next 50 years, if they wanted to give it to him.

Mr. GILLET. Was not that work done at the time when the administration was of a different political character from the House?

Mr. HAMLIN. It was; and very valuable work was done. I am only curious to know, when the control of this House passes to the Republicans next session, what they will do as to the allowance of a clerk for this committee. I predict that you will do, as you always have done, give these committees clerks whether they do any work or not. These committees ought to be given clerks or the committees should be abolished.

Mr. HASTINGS. I move the previous question.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I really agreed not to; but I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I only want to ask a question.

Mr. HASTINGS. Then I yield first to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GARD. I wanted to ask whether under the amendment offered by the committee provision is made for an additional clerk to the enrolling clerk of the House?

Mr. HASTINGS. That was attended to in the other resolution, which we have already passed.

Mr. GARD. That seems to be the one thing that is really necessary at this time.

Mr. SANFORD. That was covered in House resolution 460.

Mr. HASTINGS. Now I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. HASTINGS. Such time as the gentleman desires.

Mr. MANN. I think the Committee on Enrolled Bills was allowed a clerk at \$150 a month instead of \$125 a month.

Mr. HASTINGS. At \$6 a day.

Mr. MANN. I notice that the resolution reported by the committee strikes out the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department. Neither does it provide for the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings. I should think if any of these committees on expenditures were going to be busy, and properly busy at this time, it would be first the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, second the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department, and possibly the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings, though I do not know whether that committee would have jurisdiction of some of the frauds that have been committed. Certainly there is room for investigation, even from friendly sources.

I should be delighted to see the Democratic Party investigate some of the things in the War Department and in the public buildings which have been constructed, because even partisanship could not prevent the bringing in of severely critical reports. Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that in the next Congress the committee which will investigate the War and Navy Departments and various other departments of the Government will properly be provided with help, because we know



that in a great many places in the Government there have been rotten frauds, not to mention conscienceless actions and intellectual mistakes. It will not be so pleasant then. Why do you not commence the investigation now? Are you afraid of what you will find? Here are these committees, they want clerks, and the ones which are of least importance have the greatest demand for clerks. I hope they will go ahead. Certainly the committees of these other branches of the Government ought to be at work investigating. Throw the light of "pitiless publicity" on some of the things that have taken place.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the substitute.

The substitute was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended by the substitute.

The resolution as amended by the substitute was agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14078, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. Pending that motion I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, when the committee rose yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] had not concluded his remarks. Can the Speaker give me any information as to just how much time is remaining to the gentleman from Illinois?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if we can not make some agreement as to the limitation of time for general debate.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I am in a much more agreeable frame of mind this morning, in respect to agreement for time, than I was yesterday.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yesterday the gentleman was good enough to take my suggestion, and this morning I am perfectly willing to take any suggestion that the gentleman has to make.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understood from the RECORD that the gentleman has consumed probably 44 minutes more than this side of the House. I will ask the gentleman if he is willing to agree to 3 hours for general debate, 1 hour and 45 minutes to be controlled by myself and 1 hour and 15 minutes by himself?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is satisfactory.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, 1 hour and 45 minutes to be controlled by myself and 1 hour and 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 3 hours, 1 hour and 45 minutes to be controlled by himself and 1 hour and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Is there objection?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to get about 15 minutes this morning in some way.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman comes in at the very last minute and asks for time after I have made my arrangements to provide these other gentlemen with time.

Mr. LITTLE. That is correct. I am asking for time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Let me say this to the gentleman from Kansas: I understand that either the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill or the Indian appropriation bill will be taken up immediately after this bill is concluded. We spent all day yesterday on general debate and are going to spend three hours to-day. If we can get through with this bill by to-morrow or by Friday, the gentleman will doubtless be able to arrange for some time on these other bills, and I hope that that will satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. LITTLE. But I want to speak on this bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman wants to speak on this bill, he will have opportunity under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LITTLE. I have no objection to this, providing I get about 10 minutes, though I would rather have 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask whether the time remaining to my colleague [Mr. DENISON] is to be taken out of this time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If this request which I have submitted is agreed to, I understand that it will be.

Mr. MANN. Of course, it would be under the request, but I understand it was not to be. It is already charged up against

the gentleman from Wisconsin on the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He will have eight minutes. I am willing to make it an hour and 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LITTLE. That should give me some time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would be very glad to give the gentleman from Kansas some time, but not 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee modify his request?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Wisconsin desires additional time in order to take care of the gentleman from Illinois:

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be able to give the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. How much time could the gentleman give me?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will do the very best I can with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Tennessee modify his request?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Make it 1 hour and 25 minutes for the gentleman from Wisconsin and 1 hour and 45 minutes to be controlled by myself.

The SPEAKER. The request is for 3 hours and 10 minutes of general debate, 1 hour and 45 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Tennessee and 1 hour and 25 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, with Mr. ALEXANDER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to yield time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON]? Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] to continue his remarks interrupted last evening by darkness overcoming the Chamber.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was temporarily out of the Chamber when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] was discussing the railroad problem, or rather his solution of it.

I desire to make a few observations on the railroad question, but I am not going to attempt at this time to enter into any detailed plan or solution of the problem, and I only want to make this observation: That whatever plan is proposed or adopted by Congress to settle the railroad problem, if it eliminates from the different individual railroad systems of the country the incentive for profit and competition and private initiative, we might just as well leave the railroads where they are to-day and let the Government own and operate them. And if the zone system which the gentleman proposed and discussed will have that effect upon the different railroad systems it will be useless as a solution of the railroad problem, and we might just as well admit it.

But I want to call the attention of the House first to a news item that was carried in the Washington papers last week, which I want to read:

RAILROAD LOSS \$150,000,000—SUM REPRESENTS DEFICIT IN 1918  
UNITED STATES WILL HAVE TO MAKE UP.

It will take six months more of receipts from the increased freight rates to permit the Government to recoup its losses, officials believe. If Congress does not approve the proposed five-year extension of Federal control and as a consequence President Wilson carries out his announced intention of returning the roads to private management at an early date, the Government's loss will not be made up.

#### BIG LOANS NOT INCLUDED.

This deficit does not include the big sums—between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000—which have been loaned to railroads to help them pay for the extensive program of improvements and purchase of new cars and locomotives. These loans will be repaid eventually.

Now, that news item went all over the country and was published in most of the country newspapers. I received several country newspapers from my district carrying this

same item. In the Washington papers of January 11, particularly the Evening Star, I noticed a news item headed—

Walker D. Hines succeeds McAdoo as railroad chief.

And from that I read, as follows:

Walter D. Hines, Assistant Director General of Railroads, has been appointed Director General by President Wilson, succeeding William G. McAdoo, who now retires to private life.

RECOMMENDED BY MR. McADOO.

Mr. Hines, who was recommended by Mr. McAdoo, is an advocate of the latter's plan for five-year continuation of Government control to provide a test period and has supported most other policies of the retiring Director General, with whom he has been associated throughout the last year of Government management. He is accredited with having originated many policies of the Railroad Administration. If Congress does not enact new railroad legislation at an early date Mr. Hines favors returning the roads at once to private management, and this is expected to develop into a strongly contested issue within the next month or two.

Of course that, too, has gone all over the United States and was published in the country newspapers. Those two items will be pertinent to what I have to say on this question.

On August 29, 1916, an act of Congress became a law containing the following provision:

The President, in time of war, is empowered, through the Secretary of War, to take possession and assume control of any system or systems of transportation, or any part thereof, and to utilize the same, to the exclusion as far as may be necessary of all other traffic thereon, for the transfer or transportation of troops, war materials, and equipment, or for such other purposes connected with the emergency as may be needful or desirable.

This act was passed in view of the threatened trouble with Mexico, and afterwards, on January 1, 1918, the President, under the powers conferred upon him by this act, took possession of all the railroads of the country and began operating them under his war powers as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

On February 19 following, the bill known as the railroad-administration bill was called up for consideration in the House by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. This bill provided for fixing compensation to be paid to the owners of the railroads, the fixing of rates, the period of limitation, and the method of administration of the railroads while under Government control, and was very thoroughly and ably debated in the House. I thought then, and I think now, that no more important legislation had received the attention of Congress.

As the bill was originally prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury and submitted to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce it provided that the Government control of the railroads should continue indefinitely after the conclusion of peace, making further legislation by Congress necessary, at least under the theory of the bill, before the railroads could be returned to their original owners. Secretary McAdoo, then Director General of the Railroads, submitted a prepared statement to the House and Senate Committees on Interstate Commerce, which may be found on page 2347 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and in which he presented the reasons why he insisted that no time limit should be placed upon the control of the railroads by the Government, but that the period of Government control should by the law be made indefinite after the end of the war.

It will be remembered that the President took possession of the railroads of the country as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy in the exercise of a war power under a law which conferred such power upon him only in time of war, and upon what theory, or under what provision of the Constitution, the Director of Railroads insisted that the Government control and operation of the railroads should continue indefinitely after the end of the war was never explained by Mr. McAdoo.

The views of the Secretary of the Treasury on indefinite Federal control were promptly disapproved by the Interstate Commerce Committees of both the House and the Senate, and when the bill was reported to the House it contained a provision limiting the period of Government control to 24 months after the declaration of peace. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], in presenting the bill to the House, said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2338):

The majority of our committee are of the opinion that a definite period of two years should be set as the time limit within which such legislation should be matured and enacted. Obviously the period may thereafter be extended, if such extension be found necessary in the public interest. The majority were of the opinion that the insertion of a definite time limit for Federal control puts the burden of presenting proper measures of constructive legislation where it belongs—upon the owners of the properties—and that it is inconsistent with the public interest to allow a war control admittedly assumed for emergency purposes only to extend indefinitely in time of peace.

While the bill was under consideration for amendment, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] offered an amendment, striking out the provision limiting the time of Federal

control to two years and inserting a provision making the time of Federal control indefinite as the bill was originally prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury. Upon this amendment there were 40 Members who voted for and 143 who voted against it, showing clearly the overwhelming sentiment of the House against an indefinite or even a very long period of Government control after the termination of the war. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] offered an amendment changing the period of Government control from two years to one year after the close of the war. Upon this amendment there were 115 voted "aye" and 97 voted "no" in the Committee of the Whole; but afterwards when a separate vote upon the Esch amendment was taken in the House there were 164 for and 205 against it, showing that the sentiment of the House was about evenly divided between those who believed that the period of Government control after the war should be two years, as decided by the committee, and one year. The Senate bill fixed the time of Government control at 18 months after the declaration of peace. In conference the two Houses agreed upon 21 months as a compromise. The bill passed the House on the 28th of February and became a law on March 21, 1918. I was one of those who voted for the Esch amendment fixing the period of Government control at one year instead of two years after the close of the war. And upon its final passage I voted against the bill, because I was opposed to conferring upon the President or the Director General of the Railroads the power of fixing freight and passenger rates for all the railroads in the country, and I was opposed to allowing the President to continue his control of the railroads as Commander in Chief of the Army under a war power for a period of two years after the war had ended and peace had been restored.

Mr. Speaker, the history of this legislation shows that Secretary McAdoo was very insistent that the period of Federal control of the railroads should remain indefinite after the close of the war, and that no limitation of the time of Government control should be inserted in the bill so that the railroads would go back to private control automatically. I do not know how true it may be, but I have been told that the Secretary was deeply disappointed, even resentful, at the action of Congress in refusing to accept his views and in limiting the time of Government control to 21 months after the close of the war.

Since the Railroad Administration bill became a law, on March 21 last, Mr. McAdoo has had absolute control of all the railroads of the country except the short-line railroads, which he released from Government control before Congress had time to pass legislation preventing him from doing so. I do not intend to indulge in any criticism of Mr. McAdoo's administration of the railroads, or to raise any question as to his purpose or motive in doing anything that he has done with them. All I wish to say is that the effect of his policy and his various acts as the Director of Railroads in carrying out his policy has been to dissipate, as far as possible, the individual organizations of the railroad companies; to destroy, as far as possible, their individual identity; to divert customary business from one road to another; and, in short, to scramble the railroads together so completely that the task of unscrambling them is going to present difficulties that I am sure were not foreseen by many of us at the time this legislation was enacted.

I have been told by practicable railroad men that many things have been done which, from the standpoint of economical operation of the railroads, were wholly unnecessary, but which, from the standpoint of thoroughly scrambling the railroads, were, of course, highly effective.

But, Mr. Speaker, I arose more particularly to speak briefly of the latest developments in the railroad question. The armistice, which closed the fighting and presaged the ending of the present war, was signed on November 11, and on December 3 President Wilson appeared before a joint session of the House and Senate to advise the Congress on the state of the Union and to suggest such legislation as he thought necessary. A new Congress had been elected, preparations were being made for the peace conference to settle the international questions growing out of the war, and the people were even then beginning to look to Congress for reconstructive legislation. Everyone, I think, who has been interested in public affairs has looked upon the railroad question as one of the greatest problems that confront the country, and one that will require the earliest and most serious attention of the Congress. Most of the Members of the House, I believe, and most of the country, I am sure, expected the President to speak with some definiteness upon the railroad question, and present to the Congress some solution of it, and to suggest such legislation as would enable the Government to return the railroads to their owners within the time fixed by Congress, and at the same time



conserve the welfare of the public and of the owners of the roads.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Having taken the roads over, some legislation will necessarily be required to turn them back. Now, how are we as Congressmen going to reconcile the increase in pay of the men and the increase in passenger and freight rates?

Mr. DENISON. How are we going to reconcile them?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes; how are we going to work them out? The 2,000,000 men working for the railroad companies are going to say, "Before these roads go back we want to be protected in our wage increase." Now, how are we going to get along on that?

Mr. DENISON. There is no danger in the world but what the railroad men will be protected in their wage increase. None of us need worry about that. They will protect themselves.

Mr. EMERSON. You can not have an increased wage without increased rates.

Mr. DENISON. I think that is true, and we have got to become reconciled to the increased rates.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Just what does the gentleman from Ohio mean by his statement that legislation will be necessary in order to turn the railroads back? Does he mean necessary in the public interest? It will certainly not be necessary as a matter of law.

Mr. EMERSON. That may be true, but I do not concede for a moment that the Government is going to take over these railroads and then turn them back on the stockholders without taking care of them in some way.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It may be in the public interest, but I was interested in the gentleman's statement that it would require some further legislation in order that the railroads might go back.

Mr. EMERSON. I think it will, will it not?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It will not.

Mr. DENISON. Legally it will not, but for practical reasons some legislation will be required.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It may be very desirable, but certainly we can turn the railroads back without any further legislation.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not think the Government will turn them back without further legislation.

Mr. DENISON. I think some general railroad legislation is very desirable.

I confess I was greatly surprised when the President began his discussion of the railroad problem with the following statement:

"The question which causes me the greatest concern is the question of the policy to be adopted toward the railroads. I frankly turn to you for counsel upon it. I have no confident judgment of my own. I do not see how any thoughtful man can have who knows anything of the complexity of the problem. It is a problem which must be studied—studied immediately and studied without bias or prejudice. Nothing can be gained by becoming partisans of any particular plan of settlement."

I venture to say that this statement struck the Congress as being most unusual for the President. During the past four years there have been many far-reaching and difficult problems presented to us for solution. I think I have heard every address that has been made to the Congress by the President during that time; addresses in which he presented to us for our consideration questions which involved not only the very safety and existence of our Government, but the peace and the prosperity and the welfare of our people at home. I do not recall that the President had ever before presented a problem to Congress without giving us at the same time his solution of it. He has not only recommended what we should do, but generally insisted that we should do it. When a great railroad strike was threatened just before the election of 1916 and the difficult question of properly adjusting an industrial dispute had to be met, if I remember correctly, the President came before us in joint session and presented to us a definite and, to him, a complete solution to the difficulty. It seems, too, that the President has, during these recent trying times, evolved a formula of 14 fundamental principles, which he has enunciated and which, at least in his own opinion, have been the goal for which our men have been fighting in France, and the acceptance of which will solve all the national and international difficulties that have occupied the attention of a distressed world for the past four and a half years, and which, it is claimed, will result in peace on earth and good will among men everywhere. In fact, the President, during his terms of office, has at one time or another had under consideration many great questions which involved our international relations and our

industrial and economic welfare, and he has always had a solution that he could recommend to Congress. But how strange it was that the President, after having had control and operation of the railroads of the country for a year, and after having had the counsel and advice of the wise men of his Cabinet and of the Director of Railroads, should come before the Congress and frankly admit that he had no recommendation to make as to the disposition of the railroads.

And how strange, how passing strange, was the President's statement, that he frankly turned to Congress for counsel upon any question. I do not recall that he had ever, on any former occasion, turned to Congress for counsel. His statement that he frankly turned to the Congress for counsel upon this question was so inconsistent with the President's past attitude toward Congress that I confess I could accept it only with considerable mental reservation on my part. However, referring further to the railroad problem, the President said:

"Let me say at once that I have no answer ready. The only thing that is perfectly clear to me is that it is not fair either to the public or to the owners of the railroads to leave the question unanswered, and that it will presently become my duty to relinquish control of the roads even before the expiration of the statutory period, unless there should appear some clear prospect in the meantime of a legislative solution. Their release would at least produce one element of a solution, namely, certainty and a quick stimulation of private initiative."

And later he said:

"I hope that the Congress will have a complete and impartial study of the whole problem instituted at once and prosecuted as rapidly as possible. I stand ready and anxious to release the roads from the present control, and I must do so at a very early date if by waiting until the statutory limit of time is reached I shall be merely prolonging the period of doubt and uncertainty, which is hurtful to every interest concerned."

Gentlemen of the House, I have studied carefully that part of the President's message which deals with the railroad question. I have studied it in view of his attitude and of the attitude of Mr. McAdoo at the time of the enactment of the Railroad Administration law to which I have been referring. I have studied it in the light of the administration of the railroads by Mr. McAdoo during Government control. I have studied it in view of the subsequent statements of Mr. McAdoo, to which I will presently refer; and from my study of the message I think these conclusions are justified: That the President's statement that he had no solution of the railroad problem and no recommendation to make to Congress upon that question was, to say the least, very unusual and unnatural; that the President wished to impress upon the Congress the difficulties of the railroad problem by showing Congress that he, after having had control of the railroads for a year, and after having had the counsel and assistance of some of the ablest railroad men of the country, could not make any suggestion as to the necessary legislation; that he expected the present Congress, during this short session when all the time is usually required to pass the necessary appropriation bills, to pass some legislation upon the railroad question before the 4th of March; that in order to secure this legislation by the 4th of March the President would hold over Congress the threat that, if such legislation was not enacted, it will be his duty to relinquish his control of the roads at an early date and return them to their original owners without waiting for the expiration of the 21 months. In other words, the President knew that Congress could not possibly pass permanent railroad legislation before the 4th of March, yet he faced us with the statement that if we did not pass some kind of legislation he would relinquish control of the railroads at an early date.

The question that naturally suggested itself to my mind was, What legislation did the President want that he was unwilling to recommend or even suggest? The answer to this question is found in the recent communication from Mr. McAdoo to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House and found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12.

I hope that the Members have all read this statement of Mr. McAdoo's carefully. It purports to be a statement of his views as to the course that should now be pursued by Congress with reference to the railroads. It does him great credit as a capable, far-seeing politician. It is an ingenious argument of one who professes to be opposed to Government ownership of railroads in favor of a plan for the Government to operate the railroads for a period of five years at the expense of at least \$2,500,000,000 for the purpose of experimenting and demonstrating to the country that Government operation is the best solution of the railroad problem. This letter of Secretary McAdoo is dated December 11, just eight days after President Wilson addressed Congress on the railroad question. It is inconceivable, to my mind, that the Director of Railroads would have presented this recommendation to Congress without having consulted the President; and it is just as inconceivable to me that President Wilson should have prepared his message to Congress upon the railroad question without having fully discussed and having come



to an agreement and understanding upon the subject with his Secretary of Treasury and Director of Railroads.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes; certainly.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is it not a fact that Director General McAdoo said at the time he submitted this plan that he had the approval of the President?

Mr. DENISON. That is true. I am coming to that.

All doubt upon that question is removed by Mr. McAdoo himself, because he says, in the last paragraph of his statement, "the President has given me permission to say that this conclusion accords with his own view of the matter."

Now, let me call attention briefly to just two or three sentences in Secretary McAdoo's statement. To begin with, he says:

The war is ended, and we are now confronted with the necessity either of legislating intelligently about the railroad problem at this session of the Congress or of promptly returning the railroads to their owners.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENISON. For a brief question.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it the gentleman's idea that during that eight days' interim the President's mind was wholly neglectful of this subject?

Mr. DENISON. No; my impression is they had an understanding before the eight days.

Mr. BLANTON. He could have reached a conclusion in the eight days.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, he could have done so; but, of course, we know that is not natural; they must have had an understanding.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it the gentleman's idea that the President was not honest in his assertion to Congress?

Mr. DENISON. No; I never said or intimated that.

Mr. BLANTON. That is his insinuation.

Mr. DENISON. It is not so; I did not intend that. But possibly it might be inferred that the President was not as frank as we were led to believe.

Mr. McAdoo ignores the fact that the railroads were taken over by the Government only for one purpose—as a war necessity; he ignores the fact that the railroads were not taken over for the purpose of legislating on the railroad problem, but in order to enable us to more effectively prosecute the war; he ignores the fact that Congress has 21 months after the declaration of peace to solve the railroad problem. Why should Mr. McAdoo think that this legislation has to be passed at the present session of this Congress? He knows that the President can call an extra session of Congress for the express purpose of considering this question during the coming summer, and he knows that before the 21 months expire Congress will have met and a regular long session will have passed. What the Secretary meant but did not say was that it was necessary, in his view, for this legislation to be passed by a Democratic instead of a Republican Congress.

Mr. McAdoo further says:

It will be impossible, I presume, to secure legislation in this short period providing a permanent solution of the railroad problem. This being true, only three courses are open: (1) Government operation of the railroads for one year and nine months following a proclamation of peace, which would mean, in my judgment, Government operation for a period in no event longer than two years and three months; (2) the prompt return of the railroads to private control; or (3) extension of the period of Federal control to five years.

He then proceeds to present an ingenious argument showing the total inadequacy of the present railroad administration law, showing the impossibility of continuing to operate the railroads under the present law, because, he says, it was not enacted in some respects in the form in which he originally wanted it to be enacted; showing the disastrous results to the public and the owners of the railroads that would follow their prompt return to private control; and concluding with a recommendation and a request for immediate legislation by this Congress extending the period of Government control to five years. And the reasons why he urges that the period of Government control be extended to five years are to enable the Government to expend at least \$2,500,000,000 in improving the railroads and to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the people of the country the practicability of operating the railroads more economically under unified control.

Now, I ask the Members if it does not seem strange to you, as it did to me, that the President, in addressing Congress on December 3, should state that he had no confident judgment of his own upon the railroad problem and no recommendation to make as to what legislation should be enacted, and yet eight days later the Secretary of the Treasury and Director of Railroads should present to Congress a concise and positive recommendation and request for legislation extending the period of Government control five years, accompanied by the statement

that this recommendation and request was made with the President's express approval.

Gentlemen of the House, I think Secretary McAdoo should be entirely frank with the Congress. I think he should give us credit for possessing at least some amount of intelligence. I think he and we should be frank with the people. I do not think we should do anything under false pretenses, and if anything has been done under false pretenses I think it is our duty to disavow it promptly and effectively.

I know that Congress authorized and approved the taking over of the railroads by the Government for one purpose only, and that was as a war measure, to enable us to more efficiently prosecute the war. There are, of course, some Members of Congress who openly and frankly believe in Government ownership of railroads. But I do not believe there are as many as a dozen Members of the House who would have authorized the President to take over the railroads, either for the purpose of owning or operating them permanently by the Government or for the purpose of experimenting in Government ownership or operation, in order to test out or demonstrate the theory of Government ownership.

The people of the country have been led to believe, and we are responsible for it, that the Government took over the railroads as a war necessity. I believed then, and I believe now, that Mr. McAdoo and others connected with the present administration had another purpose in view, and that purpose was to experiment with Government ownership, with a view to grafting that policy permanently upon our Government. But this ulterior purpose was so submerged under war necessity that Congress could not thwart it, although an effort was made to do so by placing a definite limitation upon the time of Government control.

And now comes the Director of Railroads with the bold and open recommendation that we throw off the mask of war necessity entirely, the war now having been ended, and that we extend the period of Government control five years in order to carry out this socialistic experiment in Government operation of railroads; in order to expend at least \$2,500,000,000 of the people's money—and, in my judgment, it will be a great deal more than that—in making material improvements for the railroads.

Gentlemen of the House, I will not be a party to a program of this kind, which will amount to a plain deception of the people and the consummation of a questionable purpose which was begun under a patriotic pretense.

Mr. McAdoo does not state under what provision of the Constitution Congress has the power to continue the control and the operation of the railroads of the country for a period of five years when the country is not at war. The railroads were taken over by the President under the exercise of his war power. His rights under the exercise of that power must necessarily cease as soon as possible after the war has ended. There is but one other provision in the Constitution under which Congress could possibly take possession of the railroads according to law, namely, the commerce clause, under which Congress is given power to regulate commerce between the States. In the exercise of that power to regulate commerce between the States Congress could, I suppose, on behalf of the Government condemn and take over the interstate railroads and operate them. But in that case the value of the railroads would have to be ascertained and due compensation promptly paid to the owners. Congress has no power under the commerce clause of the Constitution to take over the railroads of the country for a period of five years for the purpose of demonstrating that they could operate better under a unified control or for the purpose of expending a few billion dollars of the people's money in the improvement of them. I venture the opinion that there can be found no authority under the Constitution for the legislation which Mr. McAdoo asks, and that if Congress should, after the war is ended and when no war necessity exists, pass legislation to continue the control and operation of the railroads for five years for the purposes mentioned by Mr. McAdoo, such legislation would be held to be invalid if it should be tested in the courts.

But aside from the lack of constitutional authority for such legislation, I think we should reject it because it would be morally wrong for the Government to continue in the possession of the property of the railroad companies for one purpose when we took possession of them for another.

In his letter to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee Mr. McAdoo further says:

There is one, and, to my mind, only one, practicable and wise alternative, and that is to extend the period of Federal control from the one year and nine months, provided by the present law, to five years, or until the 1st day of January, 1924. This extension would take the railroad question out of politics for a reasonable period. It would give composure to railroad officers and employees. It would admit of the



preparation and carrying out of a comprehensive program of improvement of the railroads and their terminal facilities; would immensely increase the efficiency of transportation machines. It would put back of the railroads the credit of the United States during the five-year period, so that the financing of these improvements could be successfully carried out. It would offer the necessary opportunity, under proper conditions, to test the value of the unified control, and the experience thus gained would of itself indicate the permanent solution of the railroad problem.

This suggestion of Mr. McAdoo's that the extension of the period of Federal control to five years would take the railroad question out of politics for a reasonable period is one that ought to excite our interest. To me it is amusing and might well suggest the inquiry as to whether Mr. McAdoo is speaking with more or less mental reservation or whether he assumes that the Members of Congress have had no experience with politics and are incapable of any judgment of their own as to the effect of such legislative action upon a question which ought to be an industrial or economic question only.

A more recent statement of Mr. McAdoo, it seems to me, will throw a great deal of light upon this very question, and I think ought to be called to the attention of the House and of the country. This statement was made on Sunday, December 15, and the occasion was a union peace jubilee of the associated congregations of six churches held at the Sixty-ninth Regiment Armory in New York City. Mr. McAdoo was one of the speakers, and in the course of his address he made some remarks on the railroad question which I think are exceedingly significant and afford a key by which his real attitude toward the railroads and his recommendation for railroad legislation are made quite plain. According to the New York Sun of Monday, December 16, Mr. McAdoo said:

"I don't know anything more inappropriate than the discussion of the Government ownership of railroads at a church meeting. The Government had to take over the transportation systems during the war, and the private owners had for the time being to step aside. Now, you can do what you please with them. It makes no difference to me whether you decide on Government ownership or not. The majority will rule in the matter, and I am not afraid of the decision of the majority. I think well of American people, even though they did return a Republican Congress last election."

According to the New York Tribune of the same date, Mr. McAdoo refused to forecast the future of the American railroads and said:

"I won't suggest whether I think we ought to have public or private ownership," he said. "We will leave that to the people, and I have faith in their intelligence to judge correctly, even if they did return a Republican Congress last election."

The New York Times of the same date made the following statement:

In his address Secretary McAdoo reviewed the historic points in the Nation's war policy, briefly indicating the unprecedented character of the selective-service act, the liberty loan campaigns, the war-insurance act, and digressed to say concerning the railroad problem that he did not care whether they remained under Government ownership or whether they were returned to private hands. However, he felt certain that whatever was done the decision of the majority of the American people would be decisive, and of the outcome of that decision he had no fears.

Thus Mr. McAdoo, as late as December 15, addressing the people of his own city and State, says that the question of Government or private ownership and control of the railroads is one to be settled not by the Congress but by the people. It is a question, according to the Secretary, upon which the majority will rule, and he is not afraid of a decision of the majority. "We will leave that to the people, and I have faith in their intelligence to judge correctly."

I ask you, gentlemen of the House, what does Mr. McAdoo mean when on December 11 he addresses the Commerce Committees of the Congress, telling them there must be legislation at this short session and that it will be impossible to provide permanent legislation, and that the only reasonable course we can take is to extend the time of Government control for a period of five years, and then addresses the people of New York one week later, telling them that the question as to whether or not we shall have Government or private ownership of railroads is a question which the people themselves must settle and which the majority must decide? How can the question of Government or private ownership of the railroads be made a question to be determined by the majority of the people unless it be made a political issue in a political campaign? If Mr. McAdoo meant anything at all in his New York address, he meant just what he said—in substance, that the question of whether or not we should have Government or private ownership and operating of railroads in this country is a question which must be made the issue in a Nation-wide political campaign.

In his recommendation to the Congress on December 11 he says that by extending the period of Federal control five years the railroad question will be taken out of politics; and then one week later he tells the people of New York that the rail-

road question must be made a political question and be determined by a majority of the people. The two statements of the Secretary are directly contradictory and inconsistent. If we are to look to either to find his real views, in my judgment, we come nearer getting them in his address at the union peace jubilee meeting in New York than in his communication to the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to indulge in any partisan criticism of Mr. McAdoo. But I am within my proper privilege, I think, when I compare his statements upon the railroad question and draw from them and from his management of the railroads while under his control such inferences as I think are reasonable. I believe that Mr. McAdoo believes in the permanent Government control of all railroads, and that he thinks that the continued control and operation of the railroads for a period of five years will not only demonstrate the wisdom of Government ownership but will make it necessary. When the railroad bill was under consideration last February and Mr. McAdoo insisted that the period of Government control should be indefinite after the end of the war I believe it was his intention then not only to use the railroads for the purpose of the war but for the further purpose, in his own language, of affording "the necessary opportunity, under proper conditions, to test the value of unified control."

He knows that permanent railroad legislation can not possibly be enacted at the present short session of this Congress. He knows that such legislation will be enacted by the Republican Congress which is to follow this one, and that such legislation will be passed before the next national campaign, and that the railroad question will thereby be really kept out of politics. But Mr. McAdoo wants the present Democratic Congress to extend the period of Government control five years, so that the railroads may be used as an experiment in Government ownership, and in the meantime at the next presidential campaign the question of Government ownership of railroads will be made a political question to be determined, as he says in his New York speech, by a majority of the people.

We may as well be frank with ourselves and candid with our constituents and speak plainly about this question. Mr. McAdoo does not want the railroad question settled before the next national election. He wants it settled at the next national election. What else could his New York speech mean?

Since Mr. McAdoo delivered his New York speech he has been before the Commerce Committee of the Senate and has made a statement not only urging that Congress pass legislation extending the period of Government control five years, but he has stated, in answer to direct questions from members of the committee, that if this Congress does not grant his request and extend the time of Government control he has no other plan or legislation that he cares to suggest or recommend. This attitude of Mr. McAdoo throws additional light upon his real purpose. If he has any constructive plan of railroad legislation to recommend to the Congress, he is unwilling to recommend it at this time. He is determined to have just one thing, namely, a five-year extension of Government control.

In my judgment there are two courses which Congress can take with reference to the railroad problem, either of which will make it a political issue in the presidential campaign to be determined by the people along political instead of economic lines. In the first place, if this Congress passes the legislation Mr. McAdoo wants passed and extends the Federal control of the railroads for five years, the question of Government ownership will be the dominant political issue in the next national campaign, and in that case the Democratic Party will be responsible.

In the second place, if the Republican Congress that will come into power on the 4th of next March does not take up the railroad question and settle it promptly by the enactment of wise permanent railroad legislation, then, in that case, it will be a political issue in the next campaign; and the Republican Party will be responsible.

Many of us still remember Mr. Bryan's Madison Square Garden speech delivered a number of years ago in which he advocated Government ownership and operation of all the railroads. The socialist element of the Democratic Party has for years been in favor of it. Men high in the councils of that party today, such as Senator Lewis, from my own State, Secretary Burleson, Secretary Lane, Secretary Wilson, Secretary Baker, and others, as I am informed, are favorable to it. If the railroad question is not permanently settled, so far as it can be by legislation, before the next national campaign, the Democratic national platform in 1920 will contain a straight-out declaration for Government ownership and operation of the railroads, cables, telegraphs, and telephones. That part of the Democratic



Party that can be controlled by Mr. McAdoo, Mr. Burleson, and President Wilson and Davie Lewis quite apparently want the permanent settlement of the railroad question postponed in order to experiment with it and make of it a political plaything and in order to capitalize it in the next national campaign, just as they tried to capitalize the Adamson law in the last presidential campaign.

There is a propaganda going on now all over this country in favor of Government ownership of the railroads. It emanates from Washington City and reaches to every part of the country. Press dispatches, inspired by Mr. McAdoo or by others here in Washington who want Government ownership of railroads, are sent out to all parts of the country advocating Mr. McAdoo's proposition of extending the time of Government control for five years.

As an illustration let me cite one case of what is being done. Last summer a large delegation of business men of the Mississippi Valley, who believed that water transportation on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers should be encouraged by the Government in order to help relieve the railroad situation, came to Washington to have a hearing before Mr. McAdoo, with a view to getting the Government to construct a line of barges for the transportation of bulky freight on the rivers. Mr. McAdoo referred the matter to the Interstate Commerce Commission, who gave an extended hearing. Several of the Senators and many Members of the House were present at the hearing, where the question was fully presented. Afterwards, upon the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. McAdoo decided to construct barges for the Mississippi River, and work upon them was begun. Early in December, after the armistice was signed, it was reported in the press dispatches that the Government would abandon the policy it had begun with reference to the construction and operation of barges on the Mississippi River. Immediately the business men of Cairo, Ill., sent a telegram to Mr. McAdoo to inquire whether or not the Railroad Administration intended to abandon the work it had undertaken for the encouragement of river traffic. Mr. McAdoo wired back in reply to the effect that if we are to have river transportation fostered by the Government until it is an assured success we must also accept his plan of having the railroads remain under Government control for the next five years. Let me quote from Mr. McAdoo's telegram as it was published in the Cairo Evening Citizen on December 16 last:

It is proper that I should call your attention to the fact, however, that unless Congress shall extend the period of Federal control so that a reasonable opportunity may be afforded for a fair test of the value of unified railroad operation along with coordinated inland waterway operation, the experiment on the Mississippi River may not hold out much promise. I doubt if the Mississippi River operation can produce satisfactory results if the railroads should be turned back soon to private control. The old methods of railroad competition with waterways transportation will be revived, and it is probable that the waterways experiment may not be able to survive that competition. I suggest these phases of the problem because interest in proper waterways development has been manifested frequently. I think your business men's organizations in Cairo should consider very seriously the importance of extending the period of Federal control in order that a fair test of unified operation of the railroads may be made and that along with it the inland waterways may be developed and a fair opportunity given to demonstrate the usefulness of such development.

Of course, Mr. McAdoo knows that the business interests of the Mississippi Valley are deeply interested in the revival and the development of river traffic, and he apparently hopes by this kind of propaganda to enlist the assistance of those interests in influencing the Members of Congress from the Mississippi Valley to support his proposed plan of extending the period of Government control.

And I have seen press dispatches recently indicating that there is a general campaign going on all over the country, the apparent purpose of which is to induce various organizations and interests to communicate with the Members of Congress and urge support for Mr. McAdoo's proposed plan of extending the time of Government control.

I, of course, do not know what action the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House or the Commerce Committee of the Senate will take at this session on the plans submitted by Mr. McAdoo. He insists that he is urging his plan in order to keep the railroads out of politics. I think the country understands that he is doing so in order to bring the railroads into politics. Mr. McAdoo may be able, by the approval and the support of the President, to coerce this Congress into extending the time of Government control for five years by the threat to return the railroads to their private owners at an early date. But if they do so, the people of the country will, in my judgment, hold them and their party to a strict accounting for it.

I think the Republicans in Congress should insist upon an extra session being called by the President so that permanent railroad legislation may be enacted as early as possible. We have had very arduous duties to perform here during the last

four years, and I know that it will be an added burden for the Congress to have to meet in extra session during the coming spring. But the Republican Party ought not to shirk its plain duty. It ought to assume the responsibility of settling this question during the coming year. It is an industrial or economic and not a political question and ought not to be made a political question by postponing it over the next presidential campaign.

Any person who makes a political prophecy takes more or less chance in doing so, for a certain odium results if he turns out to be a bad prophet. But I am willing to predict that if this Congress extends the time of Government control of railroads five years after peace is declared, the Director of Railroads will, under the directions of the administration, proceed with Mr. McAdoo's policy of expending from two and a half to four billion dollars from the Public Treasury in the improvement of the railroads. He will continue the scrambling of the railroads until the identity of the different systems shall have been completely destroyed.

Government ownership of the railroads will be the dominant political issue in the next national campaign, and Mr. McAdoo will, of course, expect to be the candidate of his party for President. He will hope, of course, to capitalize what has been done for the railroad men. The increase of wages, to which the railroad men were, generally speaking, entitled even before the war, but which were made immediately necessary because of war conditions, will be claimed as an asset of the Democratic Party, and particularly of Mr. McAdoo. There are some who are so shortsighted as to believe that the railroad men of this country can be herded together and voted for this party or that party, or for this candidate or that candidate, because they have been given a substantial increase in their wages. Those who are so foolish as to believe this, those who think that the support of the railroad men of the country can be purchased by giving them out of the Public Treasury an increase of wages to which they were entitled as a matter of right, know very little about human nature and about the nature of railroad men in particular. The men who work upon the railroads of this country know what they are entitled to. They are patriotic, intelligent, and understand that conditions and the necessities growing out of them, rather than the gracious favor of any individual or set of individuals, have brought about their increase in wages. They have their politics just the same as you and I have, and they have the intelligence and courage to vote their own political convictions; and the man or set of men who think that the railroad laborers of this country will be voted at the next election for any man or any political party is going to be fooled.

I have seen in the public press recently where the representatives of the four brotherhoods had refused to approve a policy of Government ownership of railroads. I do not know whether this is true or not, but if it is true it was, in my judgment, a wise decision. If the railroad men of this country are looking to their own future interests and welfare they will hesitate to allow themselves to be influenced into the support of any policy that will take from them the right by which they have won what they now have. Let them inquire of the employees of the Post Office Department of our Government and they will get some valuable information on Government control.

I am opposed to Government ownership of railroads because I believe that private initiative and competition and the desire for profit will give better railroad service than will any system of Government ownership. I am opposed to it because I believe that under Government ownership the railroads will become a political rather than an industrial or economic organization. I am opposed to it because I do not believe the people of this country should have placed upon them at this time the tremendous burden of buying and operating the railroads of the country. I am opposed to it because I think the operation of the railroads by the Government will be detrimental to the interests of all the railroad workmen of the country, as well as to the public, who has to depend upon the railroads for service.

I think there should be a permanent secretary of transportation. He need not necessarily be a member of the Cabinet, but could occupy a place similar to that of Comptroller of the Currency. He should have supervision over the interstate railroads of the country similar to the supervision of the Government over national banks. I think all interstate railroads should be compelled to incorporate under the Federal Government, and the issue of stocks and bonds should be under strict Federal control. New construction, extensive improvements, and the issue of stocks or securities should be permitted only after a certificate of convenience and necessity has been granted by the secretary of transportation. Unification of terminals and reduction of expenses should, and naturally, would, follow



from this greater Federal control. Rates should be initiated by the railroad companies themselves, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. A commission should be created to investigate and arbitrate by agreement questions of wages where such questions can not be settled by collective bargains. But private initiative, well-regulated competition, and the opportunity for reasonable reward, both to the owners of the railroads and their managers, for intelligent, efficient, and economical management of the railroads as business organizations and public agencies should never be destroyed; and railroad employees should never become employees of the Government.

I do not think it would be necessary or wise to enact legislation extending the time of Government control. The country wants better railroad service and wants the question settled soon. Congress can solve the question, and if the Republicans here are wise they will not delay it, but will enact permanent railroad legislation as soon after the 4th of March as possible. In any event, it should be done before this great industrial question is made a political football in a national campaign, even if it is necessary to have an extra session of Congress in order to accomplish it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee for agreeing to indulge me this morning, and I want to say frankly while I have very positive opinions about it, what I am going to say has nothing to do with the railroad proposition per se. Incidentally, I do make some observations that perhaps a shrewd listener might construe as a sort of indirect expression of opinion upon some phases of that question. However, my speech is to be mainly reminiscent.

With the close of the present Congress I will leave the House after 22 years of unbroken service. It has not been as distinguished as every Member secretly hopes to make his service when it begins, but it has been conscientious, and I have done my utmost at all times to advance the highest interest, political and material, of all my countrymen. I have even tried to understand and consider the affairs of my fellow men in other countries, for we are now forced by circumstances to realize that the world is in a certain way growing smaller, and all recent and current history suggests the necessity for a cultivated "international mind."

I have long had great comfort in our isolation, and I can not help regretting that the affairs of Europe and Asia have become our affairs, and if our "associates," so called, in the great war should adopt the unfriendly suggestion to unload African colonies on us our cup of bitterness will overflow. Let us pray for deliverance from all these entangling foreign alliances just as far as possible, but if impossible, if such offenses must come, I believe we should prepare ourselves in every way to meet them bravely and intelligently.

Curiously enough my effort to understand the affairs of other countries has been sharply criticized by some small-minded people who seem incapable of comprehending a world larger than a congressional district and do not appear to know that the right to live in peace and prosperity is almost as important as an appropriation for a Federal building. [Applause.]

But in spite of the inevitable bitternesses and disappointments, petty jealousies, and misrepresentations I have found pleasure in the work of a Representative. In spite of unwarranted and stupid flings at the personal honor of Congressmen, as common as they are silly, I have been proud of the office of Representative, for I was brought up to reverence that branch of our Government that the makers of the Constitution saw fit to put in section 1 of Article I of that wonderful if unfashionable document.

Just to refresh your memories let me quote the first four lines of the Constitution of the United States:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

The founders intended that this particular body should have primacy in the affairs of government, but in some respects it has fallen from its proud estate. Its great prototype, the British Commons, has grown steadily in importance and power since, under Edward the First, in the thirteenth century, the masses of England, by their representatives, were admitted to Parliament. To every patriotic American who believes in a government of the people through their representatives—the only practicable way, despite the clamor for referendum and recall and such like political nostrums—this decline in influence of the people's branch of the legislature causes grief and humiliation.

I heard a story recently that illustrates this decadence of the House. My informant said that the chairman of one of our great committees asked the chief of a department, whom he had the power to call before him, if we were to have any legislation touching that department during this session.

I try to believe that it was merely an unfortunate way of asking if the department referred to would recommend legislation before March 4.

What is the cause of this degradation of the first born of the Constitution? In thinking it over I have not been able to avoid the conclusion that it is due to a voluntary surrender of constitutional rights and duties that only need to be asserted to be respected. [Applause.] We surrender without a struggle rights that some of our British ancestors died for.

I have also reached the conclusion that unreasoning partisanship has something to do with this growth of a menace to the rights and liberties of the people through breaking down their representatives. I am a partisan, Mr. Chairman, and a strong believer in parties. They are necessary in free government, but they are not in themselves the purposes of our political organizations. Parties are supposed to stand for principles and their chief function is to see that those principles are applied to government. If that is not the purpose of their existence, they ought to perish. When devotion to mere party organization becomes so strong that principles are forgotten and loyalty to the instrument of their application is regarded as the thing of supreme importance, we have reached the danger line. That view has grown alarmingly in this body. I have heard Members jestingly say that they had raped the Constitution so often that one more outrage, if in the party interest, was of small importance.

To jest about the Constitution and the solemn oath we all take to support and defend it is as offensive to the moral sense as making jokes about a disregard of truth and personal honesty. But these things help one to understand the contempt with which legislative bodies are treated in the press and by the public they serve.

Yet, in spite of this yielding attitude, I hope and I believe that the American Congress, which is a great body, representing a mighty people, will assert itself and will regain its ancient standing and prestige.

#### THE FIFTY-FIFTH CONGRESS.

My service here began in the Fifty-fifth Congress and was mainly one of observation and attention. I found it interesting and instructive. There were some great men here at that time in both parties. There were not as many self-styled "Reformers" and "Progressives" as developed later. Those who were here were the flotsam of an earlier political wreck, yet they exercised, and still exercise, a strange and baleful influence on legislation. In my humble judgment they were not superior in virtue, and certainly not in intellect, to the frankly robust partisans in both parties. I do not mean there are not some great men here now, but I was perhaps more impressionable at that period of my career. Not all who cry "Lord! Lord!" shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and I doubt if the world will ever accept at their own estimate these holier than thou people who have set themselves the task of criticizing other men's morals and regulating other men's habits. Sometimes when I grow weary of their antics I refresh myself by reading about the Pharisee who stood and prayed thus, "God, I thank Thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as the publican," and note with some satisfaction that the verdict of the Master was for the publican, who also stood and prayed.

There was in the Fifty-fifth Congress as leader of his party one of the greatest men I ever met. His information was so broad and his intellect so keen that he could snatch the heart out of any question presented for his consideration and by a flash of his incomparable wit make clear the murkiest situation.

I have always regretted that Mr. Reed could not have lived to expose with his biting, penetrating wit a lot of the cant and humbuggery of a later day.

In that Congress Joseph W. Bailey, of Texas, was the Democratic leader, and a great one. There may have been men serving with him who were his peers; there may even have been wiser men among his colleagues; but I do not recall their names, and I am sure they could have been numbered on the fingers of one hand.

While the Cuban question was a hot issue in the early spring of 1898, there was a great deal of speech making, mostly sound and fury, and one day there was a debate in which Mr. Bailey had a leading part. The particular debate to which I refer turned on a resolution offered by him to recognize the Cuban Republic. A point of order was made that it was not a matter of

privilege, and the Chair so held. The Democrats thought the decision wrong and contrary to the rules. Mr. Bailey was vehement and eloquent in his denunciation of the decision and provoked the anger of the Speaker. The Chair made an extremely clever speech, declaring, in substance, that being a mere man he was liable to error, but that the House, in its combined wisdom, was sure to be right, and then an appeal from his decision was submitted. Of course, the perfect machine that the Republican Party of that day was sustained him.

A few minutes later I had occasion to speak to him, and went to his desk for that purpose. At the same moment a southern Member, one of those parliamentary sharps who go about with a book in hand to entrap unsuspecting and better men, also approached the Speaker. He said: "Mr. Speaker, touching your decision of this morning, concerning the wisdom of which I no longer protest, as the House has sustained you, I would like to read you a few lines from this book." "Very well," the Speaker replied; "proceed." He then read a paragraph that contradicted the position taken by Mr. Reed in his ruling. The Speaker asked him from what book he was reading. "That," the Member said, as he smiled triumphantly, "is Thomas B. Reed on Parliamentary Law." "Oh, yes," said the Speaker; "I remember. But the book is wrong." [Laughter.]

There was another leading Republican in that Congress who interested me very much, and still does. I refer to Hon. JOSEPH GURNEY CANNON [applause], North Carolinian by birth, but a citizen of Illinois by habit and for official purposes [laughter], a much misrepresented and maligned individual and as good a legislator and as honest a man, in my opinion, as ever sat in this House. [Applause.] I have never thought that the cruel fight subsequently made on him was a creditable episode in American politics.

The Republican Party under the leadership of Reed, Dingley, CANNON, Dalzell, and Henderson was a wonderful machine, always lubricated and usually working overtime and remorselessly. It was cruel but efficient, and its victims admired it while they squirmed.

It was in that Congress that I made the acquaintance of some half a dozen great Missourians. No delegation ever had three brighter blades in the intellectual play of debate than Cowherd, De Armond, and CHAMP CLARK. [Applause.] The first two are dead, and by their deaths the State and the Union were made poorer.

Three more radically different men holding the same general political views and members of the same party it would be hard to find.

Cowherd had common sense to the point of genius. Frank, earnest, painstaking, he went to the bottom of all questions that interested him and before he finished his investigation he knew all that was knowable about them. He was a man of whom it might be said of every work to which he set his hand, "Well done, good and faithful servant."

De Armond had inherited from some remote French ancestor, who may have been the victim of religious persecution, an earnestness that made him appear almost fanatical. A student of men, history, and law, his subdued unemotional voice was heard all over the House, for it compelled the respectful attention of friend and foe alike. He was a master of debate. His tongue was a rapier and its owner shrunk from no encounter. His speeches went into the RECORD as uttered and are models of concise phrasing.

CHAMP CLARK, thank Heaven, is still with us [applause], elevated to a position which I dare say he picked out for himself in the Fifty-third Congress. Some of us hope he has been preserved for an even higher place than the Speakership. [Applause.] It is useless to tell you what manner of man he is, for he is in the understanding and the heart of nearly everybody here. He would blush if I were to say more.

In order to establish the truth of history I am going to tell of an incident during the discussions that preceded the declaration of war against Spain in 1898 in which he appeared. One day he made a vigorous speech, sparring, like all the other House orators, for political position, and just as he was closing he was asked a question by that excellent and amiable gentleman, George W. Steele, of Indiana.

The question was answered by Mr. CLARK, but when the RECORD appeared neither the question nor the answer was in it. Mr. Steele wanted to know why it had been left out. The RECORD, as posterity will have it, says Mr. CLARK said in reply that the question had nothing to do with what he was discussing and that he assumed responsibility for its failure to appear, that he kept it out because it marred the unity of his speech; besides, he had previously given advance copies of his speech to the newspaper men. [Laughter.] That is what he is reported to have said. Now for the facts. It is a case like that of the

old guard at Waterloo, who said a picturesque thing, but in words that do not make choice family reading and others had to be substituted. The future Speaker told Mr. Steele that he had left the question out because it and the reply spoilt a damn good speech. The Indianian laughed good-naturedly and was satisfied.

In the course of my service I have seen the end of an epoch in the passing of the Confederate brigadiers, whose coming to Congress in the seventies caused so much unjustified alarm in the North.

What man is there, North or South, who can forget or regret the service in Congress of John T. Morgan and Edmund W. Pettis? [Applause.] Joe Wheeler, of Alabama, was in the House when I came, but soon after went into the Spanish War, and at the time of his death his faded Confederate gray uniform had become blue. McEnery, of Louisiana; the knightly Walthall, of Mississippi; Cockrell, of Missouri; and that wonderful Tennessean, Isham G. Harris, with his sturdy old colleague, Bate, as honest as the blue of the sky and as brave as Caesar, were all in Congress and all had been general officers in the Confederacy. Bate had shed blood for the Union in the War with Mexico and carried its scars with him to the grave.

I sat in the "Cherokee strip," now abolished, by the side of a Republican Member, Gen. James A. Walker, of Virginia, whose proudest boast was that he had commanded the Stonewall Brigade. Later came Gordon, of Tennessee, who was a Confederate brigadier at 25 and a gentleman to his death, more than 40 years later.

Of those with high military rank who served on the other side, so far as I am informed, there is only one left. He is a man whose mental and moral courage measures up to the rare physical quality that sustained him in 43 battles of the Civil War. It is a pleasure and privilege to know ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, of Ohio. I hope he will live to be a hundred years old and die a Member of Congress, if that is his ambition.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the most bitter Republican partisan in Congress can not now regret that those men were sent here. They were loyal and their service in Congress was an outward and visible sign of a reunited country. Some of them added other honors to their age by drawing swords for the Union in 1898, and would have done so 20 years later if it had been physically possible. Instead they sent their sons to fight and die in France and Flanders.

I wonder if our friends in England and France have ever fully appreciated the real significance of the military association of 1917. "Saxon, Norman, and Dane are we," and I believe that it was something more than a transient political tie that brought those armies together, something far deeper. The sympathy and comprehension by which they made their fight so successful had its genesis with the people from whom they sprang, with the Huguenots of France, with the contemporaries of Bacon, Drake, and Shakespeare, all of whom wrought for freedom.

It was the descendants of these liberty lovers who fought for their faith, who broke the Spanish Armada and pulled the beard of Philip, that sent the Confederate brigadiers to Congress. If they committed a sin then, was it not expiated when their sons won the praise of Foch and Haig at Chateau-Thierry and in the Argonne? [Applause.]

#### TEXAS.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a perfectly authentic story about a learned bishop who throughout a long and useful life was noted for his highly developed sense of humor. When he was on his deathbed a solicitous young clergyman asked him if he felt that he was passing away. "How do I know," the bishop replied, "I have never passed away before." This is my first swan song, and I am as ignorant of the rules for such an occasion as the bishop was of the mysteries of death. I can only hope the Chairman will be considerate and let his gavel alone until I can pay a little debt I owe to Texas before I cease to speak for her on this floor.

Of course, I believe Texas is not only the largest State in the federation but altogether the finest. I know it has the most picturesque and interesting history, even if it has no Plymouth Rock or Jamestown, and I have been amazed at the ignorance of that history of some otherwise well-informed gentlemen in Congress. It is my purpose to use a few minutes in telling just enough of the story of the great Commonwealth to encourage my friends who have asked about it to further investigation, and to answer questions that have often been asked me.

Texas has been under five flags. The Speaker, when pleading eloquently in the House for the St. Louis exposition of 1904, contended that it was at one time a part of Louisiana, and thus under the flag of France. But, omitting that claim as apocryphal, it still has vivid chapters of history under the sovereignty



of Spain, Mexico, the Republic of Texas, the United States, and the Southern Confederacy. Yoakum's history says, and I suppose it is true, that the first European immigrants arrived in Texas in February, 1685, under the leadership of Robert Cavalier, Sieur de la Salle, but there are other historians who maintain that the Spanish missionaries who visited Santa Fe had been in Texas. However, that controversy is over a detail that does not concern me now.

La Salle did go to Texas in 1685 and did, after the manner of his time, take possession of the country in the name of Louis XIV, and tried to establish a colony. Hostile Indians and quarrels among his followers led to an abandonment of the colonization project. La Salle himself was murdered by one of his own men and was buried near the Neches, or some other Texas stream, but which will probably never be known.

In 1689 the Spanish Viceroy in Mexico took formal possession of the country in the name of his King, and thereafter Spain's title was never seriously challenged until 1810 when the Mexicans, led by a priest, Don Miguel Hidalgo, revolted and declared for an independent government. That revolution was soon ended by the capture and execution of the priest, but others followed, and after 11 turbulent years the sovereignty of Spain was extinguished.

In 1821 a grant of land was made to Moses Austin, who was born in Connecticut, had lived in Virginia, and was then a citizen of Missouri, and he was authorized to introduce 300 families from the United States. He died within a few months after making his contract with Mexico, but requested his great son, Stephen F. Austin, whose inadequate effigy stands in the old hall of representatives, to execute it. Austin took the first Anglo-American immigrants to Texas in 1822, 137 years after the failure of La Salle.

The venture proved to be an apple of discord thrown into a political and social situation that was normally in a state of suppressed or open revolt.

The impossible had been undertaken. Americans, by the terms of the contract, were putting themselves under the political dominance of an inferior people. In the earth strata are imposed one upon the other, and so it usually is in political organizations. When hardy, self-reliant Americans went to live among Mexican Indians it was quickly evident that they could not long remain the substratum, contract or no contract. The Americans were all trained to the hardships of the frontier and skilled in the use of arms, and the Mexicans had been guilty of great imprudence when they invited such men to come and live among them.

The Texas of that day was, as it is now, a land of strong temptation to the always land-greedy Anglo-Saxon. Its prairies, as far as the eye could see, were a carpet of flowers in spring and its soil as rich as soil can be. Game was so abundant that men could live with the minimum of work and follow the life of adventure most congenial to the descendants of those other men who after settling the first colonies had crossed the Appalachians to open up the great West. They were dangerous neighbors to a more indolent and less aggressive race.

In 1824 Mexico adopted a new constitution that was in some respects modeled on that of this country. But there were fatal dissimilarities. For example, there was no provision for trial by jury, there was a State religion, not that of the immigrants, and Congress was to interpret the constitution.

By that constitution Texas was associated with the exclusively Mexican State of Coahuila, and known as Coahuila and Texas. More ill-matched twins were never born. The Texans did not like the constitution and had most reluctantly consented to it, but made a reasonable effort to adjust themselves to it, and violation of the few rights guaranteed to them was the technical cause of the open revolt in 1835.

From about 1830 the American settlers had grown more and more restless. The eccentric and offensive application of an unfamiliar code, disturbing incidents now and then, such things as would have been settled by a minor court in our country, sometimes an open breach of the peace when the Mexican authorities were resisted with arms got on the nerves of the immigrants, and the Mexicans failed to remember that when Americans get nervous they have a fatal trigger habit.

Petty tyrannies continued, as did contempt for the contractual rights of the colonists under which they had been induced to settle in the wilderness. Then the absolute incompatibility of the Anglo-Saxon and the Spanish-Mexican-Indian natures made a conflict unavoidable in spite of the earnest, honest efforts of Austin to prevent it. There were certain dominant, aggressive Americans in the colony who frankly wanted a break with Mexico and hardly made an effort to conceal their purpose to set up an independent government or associate Texas with the United States.

Santa Anna, the Mexican dictator, unwittingly promoted their designs. He was energetic and vicious, ambitious in a military way, and constantly referred to himself as the Napoleon of the West. He disliked and feared the Texans and wanted to expel them from Texas or destroy them.

In 1835 he forcibly dispersed the legislature of Coahuila and Texas, then sitting at Saltillo. The Texas members of that body avoided arrest and returned to their homes and quickly blew into a blaze the smoldering fires of revolution. Santa Anna's order for their arrest was disregarded but it brought matters to a head at once.

A meeting of the citizens of the municipality of Columbia on the 23d of June, 1835, issued an address to the inhabitants of the other municipalities calling for an assembly of all for the 15th of the following October. The meeting then proposed is known in history as the "General Consultation." A significant feature of the call is that the delegates were urged to ascertain and bring with them to the October meeting the number of inhabitants of their respective jurisdictions. They were already making a military inventory of man power.

The General Consultation met on the appointed day and in that meeting the Republic of Texas was really born. Two days later, the 17th of October, a letter was received from Gen. Austin, who was on his way to San Antonio with a small army to attack the Mexicans, in which he urged the delegates to adjourn their meeting and join him in the assault on San Antonio. A large number, preferring a fight to their civil duties, accepted the invitation and a few days later there was a battle between the Texans under Austin and the Mexicans at one of the missions just outside the present city of San Antonio. I need not tell you the Texans were brilliantly successful for that was their habit in such engagements.

On the 1st of November the General Consultation reconvened and published to the world a declaration of purposes and principles that was a sort of preliminary declaration of independence to be followed by a more formal one March 2, 1836.

This General Consultation continued as the government of Texas until October 22, 1836, when the Republic was organized under the presidency of Gen. Sam Houston. Gentlemen who want to understand these movements and want to know something about the capacity of these frontiersmen for the administration of government would do well to read the declaration of purposes and principles issued in November, 1835, and the declaration of independence of March 2, 1836.

It may interest you to know who the 58 signers of the declaration of independence were. Eleven were from Virginia, 9 from North Carolina, the same number from Tennessee, while Kentucky furnished 5 and Georgia and South Carolina 4 each. New York and Pennsylvania were each represented by the signatures of 2 native sons. Massachusetts, never a laggard in such enterprises, had 1 representative, as did New Jersey.

England, Ireland, Scotland, and Canada each had the name of one man on the roll of honor, as did Mexico in the person of De Zavala.

Among the interesting names found on that document are those of Sam Houston, Thomas J. Rusk, afterwards Secretary of War for the Republic and Senator in the United States Congress, and Samuel Augustus Maverick, about all of whom too little is known in other States. The names of other great figures in the Texas war of independence are better known in doubtful tradition and romance than in the dignified pages of history, where they belong. There was, for instance, Col. James Bowie, a brave and honorable member of a distinguished Maryland family of that name, who is chiefly known to his countrymen as the inventor of a knife. Then there was David Crockett, at one time a Member of this House from the Tennessee section, so ably represented by Mr. GARRETT, who is remembered mainly as the hero of hunting adventures and doubtful stories. He and Bowie fought the good fight together and died in the defense of liberty in the absolutely unparalleled massacre of the Alamo.

Another and even more interesting case of perverted history is that of Samuel A. Maverick, a relative of Samuel Maverick, the Massachusetts lad whose monument stands on Boston Common, with those of other bold patriots, who shed the first blood in the contest with King George's men in 1770.

Mr. Maverick was born in Charlestown, S. C., of well-to-do and distinguished parents, and educated at Yale College. Like many another bold and adventure-loving young man, he went to Texas in 1835 to seek his fortune. He arrived just in time to join in the revolution and to participate under Ben Milam in the assault on and capture of San Antonio. He was one of the signers of the declaration of independence, and under the Republic represented the district of Bexar in the first congress.

In 1842 he and other citizens of San Antonio were captured by the Mexican general, Woll, and marched about 1,200 miles

through an almost waterless, treeless, and foodless desert to southern Mexico, where he was imprisoned in the Castle of Perote. For months he wore a ball and chain, still proudly exhibited by his sons, and worked in the quarries.

Through the intercession of Waddy Thompson, then minister from the United States to Santa Anna's turbulent autocracy, he was permitted to return to San Antonio in time to become a member of the last congress of the Republic, that which arranged by treaty for the admission of Texas into the American Union.

And yet this brave and honorable man who spent his entire adult life in constructive work for his country has been the victim of a false and libelous story, told usually without malice, but with that preference for what is picturesque rather than that which is true, that has done such grave injustice to many of our nation-building frontiersmen. Every western man knows that the word "maverick" is used to describe unbranded cattle, but few know the origin of its use. The Century Dictionary, in defining the word, quotes as authority an absolutely correct definition made by the late Col. Roosevelt in the Century Magazine. Col. Roosevelt says "unbranded cattle are called 'mavericks,' and when found on the 'round-up' are either branded by the owner of the range on which they are or are sold for the benefit of the association"—of cattle raisers.

Mr. Maverick, a civil engineer by profession, like most enterprising men of that day went in heavily for land that could then be bought at 5 and 10 cents per acre and he never engaged in any other business.

In 1845, while he was living temporarily at Decrows Point, on the Gulf coast, a neighbor who owed him \$1,200 paid the debt in cattle at \$3 per head. He did not want the cattle but took them and put them in charge of some negroes, nominally slaves, but essentially free, and with his family returned to San Antonio. The cattle remained on the Gulf until 1853, when they were moved up to the San Antonio River, about 50 miles below the city of that name, and continued in the vigilant care of the same colored family.

Mr. Maverick was so occupied with public duties and other private affairs that he gave no attention to his herds. They were left to graze, to fatten, and wander away at will on the prairies. His unbranded cattle found on the range were referred to as Maverick's, meaning that they belonged to the herd of Mr. Maverick. They were so neglected that from the original stock of 400 taken over for debt in 1845 he still had just that number 11 years later when he sold them to Mr. Toutant de Beauregard, a brother of the Confederate general, from whom I had the story as well as from members of the family. I have seen all the letters that were written and received during those 11 years that referred to the cattle venture, and they establish the accuracy of what I am saying.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the true story of the origin of the word "maverick," as applied to unbranded cattle, and I hope that its publication in the Record will end forever the ridiculous lies about a "cattle king" who never had profit out of the business, or more cattle than the 400 head he bought in 1845 and which had not increased in 1856, when he sold them.

Let me go back for a moment to the political history of the Republic.

#### THE ALAMO.

On the 23d of February, 1836, the 150 Texas troops in the Mission of the Alamo, in San Antonio, were attacked by Mexican soldiers under Gen. Santa Anna. That was the beginning of one of the most historic sieges of all time, one of the most impressive tragedies, and in its consequences one of the most important events in history. Directly traceable to it, and the supplemental engagement at San Jacinto, was the introduction of a new member into the family of nations, and later an accretion to the territory of the United States of an area much greater than the original thirteen States, plus Kentucky, Vermont, Tennessee, Maine, and West Virginia.

On the 1st of March 32 gallant men from Gonzales joined the 150 who were within the walls of the Alamo, and none of the 182 ever came out alive. The army of Santa Anna certainly contained as many as 4,000 men, and estimates run as high as 6,000. The odds were more than 20 to 1 against Col. Travis and his men, and under such circumstances, with no possibility of early relief, the end was never in doubt. On the 5th of March the final assault was made. Among the Texans there was no thought of surrender and all fought to the death, taking an appalling toll from the Mexicans. Veracious chronicles have it that the bodies of Col. Travis, who commanded, and David Crockett, his aid, were surrounded by heaps of slain. I do not doubt that the same thing would have been said of Col. Bowie if he had not been ill and confined to his bed. But where all were heroes why discriminate?

A flame of righteous wrath swept over Texas, and the rest of the war was fought with the battle cry "Remember the Alamo." Meanwhile, Gen. Houston, for strategic reasons, had been falling back toward east Texas, and at San Jacinto, on the 21st of April he engaged and destroyed the Mexican Army that was under the command of Santa Anna himself. In a few minutes after the battle began the Mexicans were in full retreat. The next morning the self-styled "Napoleon of the West" was a prisoner and a supplicant for the favor of Sam Houston.

The Texans killed, wounded, and captured more than double the number of men in Houston's command, which was a very proper score.

However, the importance of San Jacinto is not in the number killed or the number engaged. Its political importance far outweighed all such considerations. Texas was now free, her independence recognized by the enemy, and she could begin her career as a nation. The life of the Republic that began in so much violence and disorder continued until 1845 when, of her own free will, under no compulsion whatever, by formal treaty she became a part of the great Republic of the United States. Texas was not annexed, but came like a bride, after proper wooing, in honorable marriage and protected by a prenuptial contract made between sovereignties. It is the only State of the Union that ever exercised the full rights of sovereignty in dealing with other Governments. The Republic had her diplomatic representatives in Europe and in the United States, and maintained a small but valiant army and something of a navy.

By the terms of her admission to the Federal Union Texas retained all her public lands. It was also stipulated in the treaty that the new State might cut her territory into five States, and that these should be admitted into the Union, a privilege that few people have ever thought of asserting. Each of the States so admitted, whether one or five, was to be permitted to come in with or without slavery.

I want to assure my friends from Massachusetts that that is another treaty right we will not assert.

As a Republic, Texas had a peaceful history. It is probably the only sovereignty that never in its entire life engaged in a foreign war. Texas had ministers in France and England, and both were represented in the Republic, but her people were not skilled in the arts of diplomacy and knew nothing of its forms and conventions. There was a near war with France when a simple Republican tavern keeper threatened to chastise, or, as some have it, did chastise the French minister for shooting his pigs that had wandered into the legation. Fortunately there were no cables in those days to carry such news to the Government concerned, and before France heard of the trouble the entente cordiale had been reestablished.

#### SOCIAL CONDITIONS.

Life in Texas, when these great things were being done was not all cakes and ale, nor, on the other hand, an unending round of fighting and hardships. I have in my possession at this time the diary of an unusually intelligent, educated, and refined woman that covers the period from 1836 down to the war between the States. Her stories of fierce Indian fights, some of which she saw, are as thrilling as any romance of the frontier ever published. The primitive life of the Republic and of those days is illustrated in stories, each of which is an instructive essay. The complete independence of character and utter unfitness of such people for menial service is shown in her account of a visit made to her by President Lamar and his staff. There was a great dinner to which the fine people came to pay their respects to the President of the Republic. But there was a servant problem then, as now, and our hostess had to pick up such help as she could find. A white man absolutely without experience was engaged and as thoroughly drilled as possible. After he had made one or two trips to and from the kitchen he appeared without a coat. The mistress called him to her side and whispered a command to put on his coat. His perfectly audible reply was, "I would, ma'am, but it is too damned hot."

When Texas did these great things, Mr. Chairman, when she declared her independence of Mexico and made the declaration good, there were in all that vast territory only 30,000 Anglo-Americans. Indians, Mexicans, and negroes were estimated at 22,500. The enemy challenged by the 30,000 whites numbered about 7,000,000, making odds of 233 to 1 against the Texans; but in a few months after hostilities began a new nation was born and constitutional, republican liberty was strengthened by the support of another great moral and physical force. That power never died. When it ceased to exist independently it voluntarily merged with the American Republic; the Lone Star of Texas became one of a constellation.



That, Mr. Chairman, is a very brief outline of the history of Texas to 1845. Heaven grant that the spirit of liberty and order that directed its founders when, in the midst of enemies, they set up government in the wilderness may never die, but remain forever a bulwark of defense for order and law. It seems to be needed now more than ever to avoid the dangers of radicalism sweeping over the world and the more insidious but equal peril of centralization now threatening in our own country. We must grapple with and destroy the monster of anarchy, but in doing so we should not forget for a moment that no government and too much government are both dangerous to the liberty of the people. Anarchy threatens the state and the family on which it is based; centralization in our country will destroy the federated, constitutional Union. Whether born in the disordered minds of Mujiks, who have endured centuries of oppression, or presented in the guise of an economic proposal, anarchy, as well as socialism, is an enemy of liberty and must be destroyed. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 15 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON].

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, what I wish to say is in regard to the demobilization of our military and naval forces, mostly in regard to our military forces.

On November 21, just 10 days after the signing of the armistice, the War Department issued Circular No. 77, which I shall insert in the *Record*, with the leave of the House, and shall quote only a single paragraph from it:

Circular No. 77.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, November 21, 1918.

DISCHARGE OF ENLISTED MEN FOR RELIEF OF FAMILY OR URGENT NEED IN INDUSTRIAL WORK.

1. Department commanders within the United States, commanders of ports of embarkation, and commanders of camps not under the jurisdiction of department commanders or of chiefs of bureaus of the War Department, are authorized to discharge enlisted men upon their own application when there is sickness or other distress in the soldier's family, or when he is needed to resume employment in an industry or occupation in which there is urgent need of his services, provided that such discharge will not disrupt or cripple an existing organization, and that the soldier's services can be spared. Consideration will be given to the fact that the machinery of camps must be utilized in the demobilization of the Army and due regard must be taken that it is not retarded by the discharge of personnel connected therewith.

2. The instructions contained herein apply only to individual and exceptional cases and are not intended to release men in large groups or blocks for any general employment or occupation.

3. Application for discharge under the provisions of this circular will be made in each individual case by the soldier concerned and through his immediate commanding officer. No man who voluntarily enlisted prior to April 1, 1917, will be discharged under this authority.

4. Men discharged under these instructions will be included in such weekly reports of men discharged as are required by the War Department.

5. Cases of the character indicated arising in places not covered by this authority will be forwarded to The Adjutant General of the Army for final action.

[220.81, A. G. O.]

By order of the Secretary of War:

PEYTON C. MARCH,  
General, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. C. HARRIS,  
The Adjutant General.

As you will observe, this is somewhat cryptic in its phraseology. At least it allowed opportunities for diverse action, as it was construed by different officers of the Army. Perhaps with a view of clarifying the meaning of Circular 77, or of trying to make action under it more nearly uniform, on January 6 of this year Circular No. 6 was issued. I shall read only a part of it and insert it all in the *Record*, if the House will permit:

Circular No. 6.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 6, 1919.

DELAY IN DISCHARGE OF ENLISTED MEN FOR URGENT REASONS.

1. Applications for immediate discharge under the provisions of Circular No. 77, War Department, 1918, will be acted upon as expeditiously as possible, and the applicants will be informed without unnecessary delay of the action taken. Deserving cases should be investigated, and where the applicants have not correctly or fully stated their reasons for asking immediate discharge, officers should render such assistance as may be necessary to correct them so that the applications may be properly presented and acted upon.

2. Circular No. 77, War Department, 1918, was issued to relieve domestic distress and to release men whose individual services are shown to be urgently needed and indispensable to an industry or occupation. In passing on applications under the latter head, the test to be applied is not the existence of a general shortage of labor in any trade or business, but the value to a given employer or business of the particular individual concerned, and the impracticability of securing a substitute. It will be found that nearly all cases properly coming under this head are cases of resumption of a former position in which an individual has been specially trained.

3. All applications for discharge under the provisions of Circular No. 77 will receive careful and conscientious consideration and prompt action.

(220.81, A. G. O.)

By order of the Secretary of War: PEYTON C. MARCH,  
General, Chief of Staff.

Official:

P. C. HARRIS,  
The Adjutant General.

Mr. CALDWELL. What is the number of that circular?

Mr. TILSON. It is Circular No. 6, series of 1919. The series for 1918 ended on the 31st of December and a new series began on January 1. This is Circular No. 6 for 1919.

Mr. Chairman, my contention is that these circulars, which amount to orders from the War Department, have not been fairly acted upon by junior, intermediate, and, in some cases, higher commanders.

I can not be accused of being an unfriendly critic of the Army. In fact, I have been regarded during by service in this House as a friend of the Army. I am a friend of the Army, which is sufficient cause for my saying some of the things I shall say to-day. If such conduct as I shall mention continues, it is inevitable that our Army itself will come into ill repute on account of it and the innocent will have to suffer with the guilty.

Army officers should act in good faith under these circulars and not in accord with their own convenience. From numerous cases, papers concerning which are in my possession, it appears that applications made by soldiers, accompanied by the facts clearly stated, showing dependence or showing the needs of their business, have not been accepted by the lieutenant or captain commanding the organization. Perhaps every Member here has received letters of this kind from their soldier boys in which it is stated the captain would not even accept their application. Even where the application has been accepted by the lower unit commander, somehow or other, before it gets through the office of the commanding officer and all the way up to the department commander it has been decided by some one along the line that the young man can not be spared. I have investigated a number of these cases and, as a rule, find the facts to be that a great number of soldiers are in that camp or organization doing nothing—absolutely nothing.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. TILSON. For a question only.

Mr. RUCKER. In connection with what you have just said, I have had at least two letters from soldiers in camp in which they said the lower officer or lieutenant would not accept their application for discharge because the commanding officer of the camp had told them not to do so. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. TILSON. I think that probably such letters could be duplicated by almost every Member on the floor of this House, indicating that what my friend from Missouri says is true in a great many cases.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. TILSON. Briefly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Do not the regulations require that when an application is filed it must go to the superior officer to be approved by him?

Mr. TILSON. It is the usual military procedure that when an application is properly filed it shall go through regular channels and be either approved or disapproved. I protest against the fact that they are not received in many cases. I protest generally against the attitude of Army officers as shown by their conduct in these cases. Such officers seem to regard it as more important that they should keep men in their companies, for something or for nothing, than that these men when not needed or when they can be spared should be permitted to return to their families and their business. In time of actual war everything must give way to military necessity. Family relationships and the business by which men earn their bread must suffer or be sacrificed if need be. I protest against the attempt of those clothed with a little brief authority to make such abnormal conditions permanent. When the dire necessity of war has passed men's families and their business by which they support their families resume their place of prime importance.

I wish to say that I speak only of demobilization in this country, because those across the water are on a different basis, and I shall not speak of them in this connection. I am speaking of this country, where the boast is being made as to how rapidly we are demobilizing. Thousands of men are being discharged who would gladly remain in the service longer, while other thousands are being held against their will to their great loss.

I have one instance here before me where it appears that it is well known that there will be hundreds of men discharged from

a particular unit within the next few days. One man established a perfectly good case to the effect that he is the superintendent of a large business and that he is very much needed in order that that business may go on. He is only a private soldier, and yet the officer has returned the papers disapproved on the ground that the soldier can not be spared. Discharging hundreds every day, and yet certify that one private soldier can not be spared. Meanwhile the evidence of the private soldier himself, with a number of others corroborating it, is to the effect that they are doing absolutely nothing. Yet the officer says he can not spare one man.

Mr. ROSE. Will all these complaints that we are making, without some resolution or bill upon the part of Congress, get us anywhere?

Mr. TILSON. What I am saying to-day is in order to call the attention of the country, and certainly the attention of the War Department, to the fact that even the instructions that have been sent out by that department, apparently in good faith, and which would cover most of the hard cases of dependents and business reasons, are not being acted upon in good faith. It is bringing reproach upon the War Department itself. It is discreditable to the Army.

Many of these cases of refusal are for discreditable reasons. In some cases it is because the applicants are good men and it might prove to be a slight inconvenience for the officer in command if he permitted his good men to go. He may be willing to discharge others, but if he has a particularly good man he does not wish to let him go. The reason is clerical work in some instances. A \$10,000 a year enlisted man is held indefinitely to be a clerk for a \$2,000 a year lieutenant. In other instances it is because the men are good chauffeurs. There are many of these cases. Two men came up the other day from a camp near Washington, one from my own State and the other from the State of Minnesota. They belong to the Motor Transport Corps. They said there were 70 men in their organization. They said that there never was a day in which more than 10 of the 70 men were engaged in doing anything. The only work of some of them was to drive officers to the bank or elsewhere about the city or country in automobiles. Still their applications for discharge had been refused.

In the Navy similar orders have been issued, but have been acted upon in a much more intelligent and satisfactory manner. The Navy is in a different position, too, because the Navy is not so largely demobilizing. It is trying to keep a large number of good men and would be justified in much more rigid requirements than can be justified in the Army. The Marine Corps is still better. The Marine Corps is very desirous of holding its men, especially its good men, and yet I have had hardly a case of complaint from the Marine Corps, because Marine officers are considering each individual case on its merits, and because they do not desire to keep even good men in cases where they ought to be permitted to return to their families or their business.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I will.

Mr. McKEOWN. I want to know whether the gentleman has any information to the effect that where Members of Congress write commanding officers they immediately turn down and refuse the request because it comes from a Member of Congress?

Mr. TILSON. I do not know that I can blame an Army officer so very much for that, because that is not good business. It ought not to be so that an Army officer will discharge a man simply because a Member of Congress writes him to do so. We should not ask for anything of that kind. Where a good case has been made, where a man, on his own application, accompanied by the proper statement, has shown that family or business reasons bring him within the rule laid down by the War Department itself, then the rule should be acted upon in good faith and the man discharged from the service.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman does not mean to say that a Member of Congress has not the right to ask a commanding officer to consider the facts?

Mr. TILSON. Such a request is perfectly proper, but it ought not to be necessary for a Member of Congress to ask an Army officer to consider the facts. He ought to do it as a matter of right upon the application of the soldier without the necessity for any request on the part of a Member of Congress.

Mr. RUCKER. What are we going to do if he will not do it?

Mr. TILSON. I think something ought to be done. The War Department itself should do something. After the attention of the War Department has been called to these facts, if nothing happens there, then something ought to be done here.

Mr. RUCKER. If the gentleman will pardon me, I do not think I ever saw a better place in the world where the gentleman's remarks would fit in than in a case where I gave one commanding officer the devil and got results by so doing.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman did well, but such extreme measures ought not to be necessary. Such conduct on the part of Members of Congress generally might not be considered a proper course, and surely it ought not to be necessary to follow it. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, if this sort of thing goes on, the Army is going to be made the most unpopular institution in the whole country and Army service is going to be made the least desirable of our services. It ought not to be so. We are demobilizing millions of men, and they are being discharged every day. It is not necessary for us to keep all of these men in the service, and it is so stated by the War Department. Then, it seems to me, we ought to discharge those men who present good cases under the rules laid down by the War Department itself—good cases of family dependence or of business needs.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think these orders of the War Department are in good faith?

Mr. TILSON. I do not say that they are not in good faith. They are apparently in good faith. Under them some Army officers are acting intelligently and wisely and discharging the men who ought to be discharged.

Mr. MANN. Well, if these orders are issued in good faith and are not being carried out by subordinate officers, do not a lot of these officers need to be court-martialed for refusing to accept papers that they are bound to accept, but who are paying no attention whatever to the regulations and terms of discharge?

Mr. TILSON. Yes. I think a lot of officers ought to be reprimanded or court-martialed for not acting properly under these orders.

Mr. MANN. I think it emanates from the head of the War Department here and the Chief of Staff.

Mr. TILSON. Wherever it originates, it ought to be done away with, and if the head of the department is responsible for it he ought to be severely criticized until he stops it.

Mr. MANN. The delightful head of the department, not knowing what is going on in the department, takes the word of some officer, and everything is "lovely" with him.

Mr. PAIGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. PAIGE. I want to cite a case in my own town, where a man had three sons in the Army. One has died in France, another has died here, and he himself has died, and the man's wife is totally dependent on the other young man left in France. Ought he not to be discharged?

Mr. TILSON. On a proper statement of those facts to the commanding officer he should be discharged, without doubt.

Can I have a couple of minutes more?

Mr. STAFFORD. How much time did I yield to the gentleman?

Mr. TILSON. Ten minutes; and I have two minutes left.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman state why the veterinarians are retained in the service? My understanding is that the Army is disposing of the horses, and these veterinarians are not needed. I understand there is not a horse within 600 miles of where the veterinarians are stationed, and still they are kept in the service.

Mr. TILSON. That is probably true. The great cry that I hear, coming up from the men in all of these camps is, "We are doing nothing; we are eating Uncle Sam's chow and receiving his pay, and we are doing nothing."

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. In connection with the colloquy between the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] I want to say that if the gentleman from Connecticut brings his great intellect and usefulness to bear upon the problem, I hope he will not fail to put into his legislation something that will demobilize some of these titled officers. I think there is where the trouble lies.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is right, as usual. I believe the trouble lies with some of these titled officers. I believe that the reason why many enlisted men are kept in the service is



that some of these Army officers, who are holding better jobs now than they ever held before in their lives, wish to keep a large number of enlisted men in the service in order to make their jobs more important and more permanent. That is the nub of the whole matter, in my judgment. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I think the gentleman hit the bull's-eye that time.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Does the gentleman know who is at the head of the demobilization service in the Army?

Mr. TILSON. There are several heads. Beginning up at the very top, there is the President, who is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, then the Secretary of War, the department commanders, and so on down to the little fellows.

Mr. CALDWELL. The gentleman knows, if he knows anything about it at all, that Col. E. D. Anderson is in charge of it.

Mr. TILSON. That fact is of no importance in this connection. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take advantage of my position in the House to say anything about men who can not appear on this floor and answer me, and for that reason I am not using any names this morning. If it shall become necessary, I have a considerable list of names here where, in my judgment, Army officers have not acted in good faith, and I shall make it my business to present these names here and have them printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with the facts in the several cases, and show that they have not acted in good faith. I do not wish to do this if the proper result can be brought about in any other way. As I have suggested, I do not think it right, on general principles, to attack men here where they can not talk back. For that reason I shall not be specific as to names in my remarks to-day. However, I have the facts and names here before me, to be used if necessary, and I have no doubt that other gentlemen in this House can duplicate these facts. Something ought to be done, and if the War Department itself does not voluntarily do it, then our assistance should be given here in the form of legislation or the withholding of appropriations. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROSE] three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I take it that every Member of this House is able to reproduce all of the cases that were submitted by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I have tried under the rules issued by the department to give instructions concerning discharges, and I received a letter yesterday from a lady well known in the city of Johnstown, Pa., and now located at Newport News, Va., with her husband, commenting upon the application of the latter. The application for his discharge was made in accordance with the orders promulgated by the War Department, and accompanied by affidavit from the employer of the soldier and by letter from the State employment bureau giving the reasons upon which the application for discharge was based. I understand that the order was approved by the captain, by the company commander of the soldier, and the major, and subsequently recalled by the major. From the letter mentioned, bearing date January 12, 1919, I quote the following:

I called the major yesterday to ask him about the papers, and, Mr. Rose, he acted anything but a gentleman to me, saying that he thinks I should be satisfied that my husband was allowed to stay with me at night; also that I have been able to work.

The reply of that official is brutal, if not suggestive. This is only one of many cases that have come to my notice, but I desire to call your attention to another case which strongly appeals to me. It is that of a well-known physician residing in Johnstown, Pa., who has been assigned for duty in one of the hospitals in the State of New York, and in his letter, among other things, says:

We have no patients in this hospital at all, and it certainly is distressing to sit around all day long with nothing to do. Some of the doctors have been here for three months and have not done a tap in all this time.

And yet he is unable to obtain his discharge from the service. For reasons well understood, I do not give his name, and I have declined to make a personal request for his discharge for the reason that any attempt upon the part of Members of Congress to assist in that direction have been frowned upon. Something must be done. There should be an investigation. Without definite action I think that all the complaints that we are making can get us nowhere at all, and, of course, the Army will get into disrepute unless we can do something to satisfy

the people that the discipline in the Army of the United States is what it ought to be.

I am reminded this morning by a communication from a very distinguished gentleman in the congressional district I have the honor to represent that the Members of this Congress are not doing right by the people; that they are sitting idly by while our young men are compelled to remain in the Army, where they are not needed, and prevented from taking up employment in places where their services would be of inestimable value at this time.

When we do make efforts to strictly follow the orders given by the department, but which contain a reservation holding the balance of power, we get nowhere. I am tired of having these complaints coming by the score, but with all the agitation and all the just criticism which has been made against the War Department, we are no nearer the solution of the problem than when we started. Of course, I am not in position to say who is to blame, but I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] that something must be done and done quickly in the interest of our soldier boys. There must be some authority somewhere, and I trust that an investigation will soon follow, resulting in discharges and demobilization in accordance with the orders that have been issued and which we have tried so diligently to follow.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KEY].

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have been directed by the Committee on Pensions to inform the House that the committee to-day, by unanimous vote, approved the bill (H. R. 13879) granting to Mrs. Edith Carow Roosevelt, as widow of the late Col. Roosevelt, a pension of \$5,000 a year, and instructed the chairman of the committee to prepare a report and file it at the earliest possible date. Just as soon as this report is in, which will be in a day or two, it is my intention to ask the House to take favorable action on the bill.

Mr. DYER. I ask for half a minute.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri half a minute.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman from Ohio probably knows that the Senate passed this same bill yesterday. Why not call it up and pass it here?

Mr. KEY of Ohio. The House bill was introduced first.

Mr. DYER. Well, I know; but the Senate passed a similar bill yesterday.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. The House bill was introduced some days prior to that in the Senate and has been duly considered by a House committee, as it should be, and reported. I think the House bill, of course, should be considered by the House after the House has referred it to one of its own committees and that committee has faithfully and promptly considered and reported the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, lest we forget how many people are involved in the difficulties that attend the demobilization of the Army, it is well to remember that approximately 2,000,000 men are yet in France and that approximately 1,500,000 men are in the cantonments in this country.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. How many have been discharged?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I can not say. I understand that we have had approximately 2,200,000 men overseas and that approximately 300,000 have been returned from overseas.

Mr. GORDON. There have been over 1,100,000 discharged. Our Army must have been a good deal bigger than I supposed it was if the gentleman's figures are approximately correct.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. So far as the number overseas is concerned, I have my information from a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. I am absolutely at a loss to know how many have been discharged in this country. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. GORDON. The last statement I saw was that something over 1,100,000 had been discharged.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. In this country?

Mr. GORDON. No; altogether.

Mr. MADDEN. The statement was that 1,150,000 had been ordered discharged, of whom 693,000 had been discharged.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. At least, there is such a large body of men involved that it certainly is worth our while to make note of the magnitude of this question. In addition to that, there are also 100,000,000 people in this country who are so interested that when these agencies of the Government are indicted the indictment is not by the gentleman from Illinois or

the gentleman from Massachusetts. The indictment is from the cantonments; the indictment is from the hospitals; the indictment is from the homes of these boys. It is said that the War Risk Insurance Bureau is working inadequately. It is said that the mail to the boys in the hospitals is not delivered. It has been said without contradiction on the floor of the House that 8 or 10 carloads of mail sent to France have been returned. It has been charged that the condition of camps and hospitals in France is not only unsatisfactory, but that there has been almost criminal negligence in the care of them. That indictment comes up out of the hearts of the great people of this country, who were solidified behind this Government and gave freely of their substance, and gladly, though with heartstrings breaking, gave of their flesh and blood. Yet all we can do here is to voice their protest. It is a grave charge against the conduct of these various agencies. On the question of demobilization you, as well as myself, have had much experience. I find that men who have positions waiting for them, men who are anxious to get out, and who have made application, find that some petty captain declares that the services of the man are indispensable. Then they come to the Congressman and the Congressman writes the captain, and then they telegraph to him again that the application has been denied. Then the Congressman goes up to see the adjutant general, and goes around and around in a circle until finally, now and then, a man is discharged.

Mr. BAER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BAER. Does the gentleman know—I have heard it stated by several Members—that the department has removed the provision allowing the boys to make application in order that they may go back into educational institutions, and that it will not allow the boys to get out of the Army for that purpose any more. Does the gentleman understand anything about that?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. All I know is that I had a young man in my office this morning who has had two years of college work and who is a private. I said to him, "Do you want to stay in or get out?" He said, "I would like to finish my college course." I said, "What opportunity have you for getting out?" And he said, "It looks as if there were no opportunity at all."

Mr. CALDWELL. What was the line of work the young man was doing?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. He is connected with a medical unit. I asked if he was very busy, and he said, "Oh, I am punching a typewriter most of the time, though I am from the farm and never had any experience with a typewriter until now. A competent typist could do eight times as much as I can do in half the time."

Mr. CALDWELL. Who is going to do the punching of the typewriter if you turn him loose?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. The gentleman has asked a legitimate question. There are men who do not want to get out; there are men who are willing and anxious to remain in the Army. Why not say to the boys, "You who desire to remain and continue as soldiers indicate it, and then let us discriminate in respect to these discharges."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. May I suggest to the gentleman in answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], who is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, that I introduced a resolution authorizing this department to employ civilians to do this clerical work and all work not of a military nature. That resolution is before his committee at this time. We can release thousands of boys all over the United States if the Committee on Military Affairs would only report that resolution.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I understand that one of the executive departments of the Government to-day has many men detailed to it for doing clerical work, and they are being retained in the Army, yet detailed to another department in work not in immediate connection with the Army. I am inclined to think that, so far as demobilization upon the other side is concerned, it would be wise to authorize the organization of an army of 500,000 men who would volunteer out of the men who are over there to do the work that yet remains essential on the other side. No man is so foolish as to think for a moment that we should immediately, with the armistice still pending, withdraw all of our troops from Europe. It would be an act of bad faith on the part of the Government, and yet it is not true that a reorganization permitting the men to enlist who desire to extend their time in Europe would be a wise thing for this Government to enact? [Applause.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. FAIRFIELD was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I agree with everything that has been said on this floor about the difficulties we are laboring under in getting our soldiers discharged from military service. I wish to direct the attention of the committee in the time allotted to me to another matter that has been brought very forcibly to my notice by occurrences in my home city, Greensburg, Pa. The great Lincoln Highway extends through that city and extends across the State of Pennsylvania. It has been rebuilt by the State at a very great cost, and over that road the United States Government, since the fall of 1917, has been transporting the automobile trucks for the use of the Army from the factories in the West to point of shipment at Baltimore. I was home on Sunday, December 29. That was a very cold day in that locality. The basement of the First Presbyterian Church of that town has been turned over to the ladies of the city, who have organized a society for the voluntary and charitable subsistence of these troops who are operating these truck trains. They did this all last winter during the severest weather we have ever experienced in that climate. They sent out from this church kitchen, at all hours, day or night, very frequently several miles to where these boys were stuck in the snow, sandwiches and coffee, and at times men to shovel snow to help to bring them in. They have also refitted the State armory there, at considerable expense, by private subscription, in which these men are and have been at night comfortably housed. I thought that this had ceased with the signing of the armistice, but my attention has been called to the fact that this situation continues, and I want to have read from one of the leading daily newspapers of my district, the Greensburg Daily Tribune, an excellent and forceful editorial, printed on the 10th of this month, giving a description of the conditions that exist among the men driving these trucks, to which I wish to direct the careful attention of this committee, and I ask that in my time the Clerk read that editorial, and then I shall make some further comments about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

[From the Greensburg Daily Tribune, Jan. 10, 1919.]

#### SUSPEND BRUTALITIES.

The truck-train soldiers passing through Greensburg these rough days must agree that Sherman was eminently correct in his estimate of war. These truck-train boys have been exposed to cruel suffering. They deserve better, and they should get better than they are getting.

It is a privilege and a pleasure for the good women of Greensburg to entertain, feed, and generally make comfortable the young soldiers now being compelled to face the winter blasts just to pilot truck trains to the seaboard when they are not needed. To them it is no longer a question of loyalty or devotion to their Government. Last winter the boys who came to this town half frozen and underfed were inspired with the confidence that sometime, sooner or later, they would go abroad and get a taste of the war for which they longed. Now there is no promise or hope of that sort. The men are simply moving trains of the trucks to the East, where they are not needed, and they are forced to the painful exposure without sufficient clothing to keep them comfortable, and without arrangements for their substantial food other than that provided by the generous communities through which they pass. They have no money and many of them go unshaven on that account.

Many of the young soldiers who spent Wednesday night in Greensburg had not been paid for months. Many of them complained that they needed warmer clothing. They confessed the need of clean underclothes, and most of them admitted that their suffering would have been intense had it not been for the Red Cross and the kindly communities through which they pass.

That condition is offensive. It should not be allowed. The Government with billions to waste should be forced to provide better for its soldiers who are probably serving favorite contractors better than they are serving their Government.

The soldiers are always welcome in Greensburg. They are always generously treated when here, but the soldiers should be paid what the Government owes them, and they should be privileged to rest during violent weather. The war is over and its brutalities should be suspended.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, two statements in that editorial I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of this House. The first is that these soldiers are not paid. Why is it? Here are soldiers who are never outside of the limits of counties or cities in which there are located banks, and who have not been outside of the country. If they had checks, they could get money at any time while passing through the country. Yet they have not been paid for months. When I came out of the church on this Sunday in December when I was home I saw 40 Army trucks lined up on either side of the street in front of the church. I went down to the basement to see the boys in the dining room, where dinner was being served to them, and I found many of them without overcoats, complaining of the cold and of the hardships to which they were subjected. I know from personal experience that these men when they are taken to the drug stores for medicine must ask to have the bills paid by the man or the woman who accompanies them, because they have no money. This is not right. There is no rea-



son why these men should not be promptly paid and not made mendicants and beggars.

I desire to bring to your attention another matter alluded to in this editorial, and that is the continued purchase of automobile trucks for the use of our Army. I am told there are now over 100,000 automobile trucks in France, and if anyone makes the trip by rail from Washington to the city of Baltimore he will see acres of Army autotrucks standing over near that city in mass, not being used, the canvas tops rent by the winter winds and the machines rusting and going into decay. Yet the War Department is still going on buying automobile trucks 60 days after the cessation of hostilities. What is the use of this? I appeal to the Members of this House that something ought to be done to stop this waste of the public money. I understand that under the Constitution Congress controls the purse and the sword—at least the Supreme Court has so decided. We have sheathed the sword, and now why do we not take control of the purse? Under the Constitution, as I understand its terms, the unimpaired power of investigation rests in this branch of Congress. Why will Congress not investigate and find out where the money is coming from that is being wasted in buying these useless automobile trucks?

I have introduced a resolution calling on the Secretary of War to report to Congress the number of automobile trucks that our Army has, the purpose for which they are being used, the number being purchased, and what it is proposed to do with them, and where the department is going to get the money to pay for them, because I do not believe in getting up on the floor of Congress and pointing to a wrongful act which amounts to almost a crime, as in this instance, and not suggesting some remedy. We have made no appropriation specifically for this purpose.

Last week when we passed the bill to legalize contracts and permit settlement under contracts, it was reiterated over and over again during the debate that the only reason that bill was being passed was to permit settlements under contracts that had not been formally reduced to writing and properly executed. Are not these automobile contracts in writing? If they are, every one of them contains a clause permitting the Secretary of War to cancel the contract whenever he wishes to do so; and the act we passed last week was to permit an adjustment and settlement promptly out of court of any damages arising from such canceled or unfilled contracts. Yet, notwithstanding full legal authority is vested in the Secretary of War to cancel any and all contracts for the purchase of automobile trucks, still the procession of trucks continues to flow from Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and the West over the Lincoln Highway, not destined for Europe but to Baltimore, where these Army trucks, standing side by side, cover acres of ground, standing out in the open winter weather and going into rapid deterioration and decay. This item, in the aggregate, amounts to millions and millions of dollars. It is the duty of this Congress to stop it, and I hope the majority party will allow my resolution to come out of the committee and be adopted, so that Congress can put a stop to this reckless waste.

Why does not the Secretary of War cancel these contracts and stop this waste? These automobile trucks that I saw there, 40 of them in the first train and 10 later on that Sunday afternoon, cost the Treasury of the United States not less than four or five thousand dollars each. Where is the money coming from? Is the Government going to sell them to recoup the Treasury? Down in Georgia the other day, you gentlemen will remember, the Quartermaster Department had a sale of horses and mules that the Government had bought at a cost of from \$200 to \$250 apiece and sold them at from \$40 to \$75 each, the report further says, and the department has 8 or 10 sales advertised of a like character. What will the Government make out of the sale of automobiles if it is losing on the sale of horses and mules the great sums of money such as indicated by the report of these sales? Oh, gentlemen, I think it is high time—high time, indeed—that this Congress should assert its right and demand to know how the money in the Treasury of the United States is being expended now that the war is over. We have come to a time in this war that no man ought to be accused of the crime of disloyalty or unfairness to the administration if he questions such expenditures. I voted for every dollar that was asked by the administration during the continuance of the war, but now I, for one at least, asserting my privilege as a Member of this House, want to know why this money is being uselessly expended in buying automobile trucks 60 days after the war is over. I speak of this because it is an item to which my attention was directed while these trains of Army trucks were passing through my home city and about which I know something from personal observation.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Briefly.

Mr. WINGO. Can the gentleman give the names of concerns with whom the Government has made contracts to buy automobile trucks since the signing of the armistice?

Mr. ROBBINS. I do not know the name of any contractor with whom contracts have been made since the date of the armistice. These trucks, I was told by one of the men running them, were made in Detroit. I did not look at the name on the trucks to see whose make they were and I do not know these facts, and I have introduced a resolution to go into an investigation of this whole matter, and hope the gentleman from Arkansas will stand with me and support it.

Mr. WINGO. I should be glad to have such information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to ask permission to refer to a matter in the bill perhaps not up for discussion just at this time. Some time ago Congress passed a law creating the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. [Laughter on the Republican side.] When that law was passed it was my understanding—and I should have known more about it, but I did not give the matter sufficient study—that that bureau was to only have control over the insurance taken out in the interest of the soldiers during this war. I did not understand that it was to have control of the pensions of soldiers in this war.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. And when this bill was reported my attention was then called to this feature of the bill. The time must come when this Congress must change existing conditions and existing law in this respect. We are throwing away a very large sum of the people's money.

I notice and you will notice on page 98 of this bill that there is an appropriation for the Pension Bureau, where there are more than 635,000 pension claims to be cared for, of \$1,246,540. In addition to that sum there is \$100,000 for field service and \$6,000 for other matters, making a total of about \$1,352,000. In the very near future these allowances to dependents of soldiers in the war will pass out, and allotments to these people will be in the past, and the insurance carried by the Government on the soldier will be transferred to some insurance company undoubtedly, or discontinued, but if you will go to page 42 of this bill you will find a sum of \$10,989,000 appropriated in a lump sum for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. No limit as to number of employees; no limit as to salaries, and so forth. Why, that department is scattered over this town in 15 different buildings, and, so help me, it will take a week to get five minutes of information in any of them. [Laughter.] I wrote on the 9th of December to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, asking whether or not a certain soldier who had lost his life had taken out an insurance policy or made application for insurance. That afternoon I received two more just such inquiries, and I took the three letters, and after going to the third building I found that those boys had made application; the one I had written about had made application in August, 1917, for a \$10,000 policy. I examined the papers myself; they were furnished to me by a clerk. Three weeks later I received an answer to my letter written that morning of the 9th saying there was no application made by the soldier on file anywhere to be found. He had named as beneficiaries his father and mother, one-half to each. Now, there is \$10,989,000 appropriated here for the maintenance of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and it is three, four, or five times as much money as would be necessary to do that same work if that bureau is merged into the Pension Bureau. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; I will be glad to do so.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman think there is room in that old Pension Office to house those 14,000—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They ought not to have any 14,000.

Mr. FORDNEY. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman think the proposition of their being scattered in 15 buildings will be cured by putting them in the old Pension Office—

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me give you some information, my good friend, and this information comes from the Pension Bureau, that if we were to give the Commissioner of Pensions 500 extra clerks he will do the business for which you are asking now an appropriation for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of



\$11,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what the Pension Bureau will do.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield further? Surely the gentleman does not think that the compensation end of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is comparable with the Allotment and Allowance Division—

Mr. FORDNEY. What I do say, my friend—I have only five minutes, and I will have to conclude in that time—is this: This insurance that the Government is now carrying for the soldiers is going to be discontinued in a short time, or transferred to some of the old-line insurance companies.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, now—

Mr. FORDNEY. Wait a minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman does not want to make that statement.

Mr. FORDNEY. The chances are it is going to be discontinued. So far as to the soldier that returns from the war uninjured and in good health, a man that requires no Government aid, there is no reason for the Government insuring the soldier after the war is over, the soldier that comes out sound, and he may not continue his insurance with his Government—it is optional with the soldier. He quite likely will transfer his policy to some old-line insurance company. The allotment to his family, his wife, or his mother, or his father will be discontinued the minute he is discharged from the service, and all that will be left for the Government to do will be to pay this compensation, which is a pension in every sense of the word, although we may have given it another name.

Mr. MADDEN. And more than that, you have all these clerks to pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman believe that the 95 per cent of our enlisted force who have taken out insurance will surrender that insurance and take insurance in private insurance companies when the Government is giving them rates which do not charge up the cost of administration and which are less than those charged by private insurance companies?

Mr. FORDNEY. I saw a tabulated statement given to a discharged soldier the other day which showed the amount of premium he must pay monthly upon his policy for a term of years. The rates went on up and up and up, and if the soldier lives to be an old man the rates will go so high that he can not afford to pay it. I think he could get old-line insurance cheaper, and he will not pay it. Whether the Government is now willing to carry this insurance during the war and after the war for a time or not, Congress will repeal this law sooner or later. I am speaking of the well soldier, not those that have been disabled or who have lost their lives.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman remember when the bill was being debated on the floor the proposition was made that the Pension Bureau be used for this particular work, and that it was resisted by gentlemen who were advocates of this bill?

Mr. FORDNEY. I am frank to tell you that I was not fully informed at that time; if I had, I would have opposed the bill.

I had the impression that any pensionable feature of the bill would be under the jurisdiction of the Pension Bureau.

If no pension or compensation legislation had been enacted covering military and naval service in the present war, all claims for death and disability incurred in such war would have been adjudicated in the Bureau of Pensions, in accordance with the existing general pension law; and that is what I supposed would be done. No action on the part of Congress was necessary to have all claims based on disability contracted in service and line of duty. Such claims were provided for under the general pension law.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The proposition was made to use the Pension Bureau, and it was vigorously resisted by those who were proponents of the bill on the theory that it could not be used for that purpose.

Mr. FORDNEY. Gentlemen, there is no justification to-day in continuing in existence this Bureau of War Risk Insurance, so far as the compensation of the soldier for disabilities received in the Army is concerned; none whatever. That is a pension pure and simple and is going to continue to be one, and I want this Government to be generous to the poor fellow who has lost an arm or a leg or an eye or his reason. I want to see that compensation sufficient to care for him the balance of his life in a respectable manner. But there is no justification for this appropriation. I call your attention to the fact that there are more than 635,000 pensions being cared for, for a little over \$1,350,000. The entire enlistment in this war is about 4,000,000, and to-day it is costing us \$11,000,000 for the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and less than 500,000 casualties reported.

Mr. MADDEN. How would they be able to keep these clerks if we did not make this appropriation? Of course, we have got to keep them, whether there is work for them or not.

Mr. FORDNEY. The clerks ought to be kept at home in the pursuit of business, where labor now can not be found to do the work that is to be done. And yet I am told there is a bill before this House to exclude from the United States all immigration for the next four or five years. Some gentlemen come in here shouting about the high cost of living. The high cost of living is going to continue so long as the high cost of production continues, gentlemen. What is the use of playing the part of a demagogue? Why not tell the truth? We know that the man who advocates low cost of living and high cost of production is one of two things, he is either dishonest or a blamed fool.

Therefore, gentlemen, I say the time is coming and is close at hand when, for reasons of economy and efficiency, this war-risk insurance must be discontinued as a Government activity, and the compensation, pension, feature of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance act must be merged with the Pension Bureau.

That fact is patent to me, and I feel confident that an examination of the history of the two bureaus will convince any reasonable mind of the correctness of my conclusions.

The act providing compensation, pension, for death or disability contracted in line of duty in the military or naval service of the United States in the war with Germany was passed October 6, 1917. It placed the jurisdiction over such claims in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. That bureau has 13,000 or more employees, so I am told.

Out of the number of employees engaged on the compensation claims, possibly 1 or 2 per cent have had some experience in similar work. The great bulk of them had no previous experience. While the character of the work was old, it was new to the people to whom it was given by law to do. The office was a newly created and newly organized one, made up of inexperienced personnel and without the aid of necessary physical machinery.

It is not surprising or astonishing that under such conditions the organization has failed to function satisfactorily and that its failure has become notorious. You are all familiar with the conditions or with the complaints growing out of them and know as well that there must be a remedy provided.

As was so well said by my friend FULLER the other day:

Since the foundation of the Republic all of the pensions paid to soldiers, seamen, and marines have been paid through the Pension Bureau. All of the archives relating to such claims are on file in the Pension Bureau. This comprehends the War of the Revolution, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the various Indian wars.

So the Pension Bureau has had jurisdiction over all claims for pension based on death or disability contracted in line of duty in the United States military or naval service in all wars and during time of peace up to October 6, 1917. After that date jurisdiction is vested in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in all cases in which the soldier or sailor was then or thereafter in service, unless the right to pension accrued before that date.

The Bureau of Pensions is quartered in the Pension Office Building, a building constructed expressly for its work, and is perhaps superior to any other office building in Washington for its purpose. You are all familiar with its dimensions, its large, well-lighted, and ventilated court and rooms, the rooms receiving light from the outside as well as from the court. It is supplied with all necessary modern machinery required for preparation and payment of pensions or compensation.

The Bureau of Pensions has an experienced force of employees, trained in the work of adjudication of claims. The employees number less than 1,000, and, in my judgment, an increase of that force of not to exceed 500 would be wholly adequate to perform all of the functions of the Pension Office, together with that part of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance devoted to the settlement of claims for compensation, and to perform the work with reasonable promptness.

The Bureau of Pensions has not only a trained, experienced, and well-disciplined office force, medical and legal, but it has local boards of examining surgeons, single surgeons, and specialists located conveniently throughout the United States in probably 1,500 places. These surgeons have been selected by reason of their skill in medicine and surgery and have had long experience.

The Bureau of Pensions also has a skilled and experienced force of special examiners for field work, which is necessary for the protection of the Government incident to the aid it gives to proper settlement of just claims.

Now, the cost of the administration of the Bureau of Pensions for the year ending June 30, 1919, will not exceed the sum of \$1,322,620, as that is the total amount appropriated for that



purpose. The amount carried in the current appropriation bill is \$1,246,540.

If the compensation feature of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance be transferred to the Bureau of Pensions, the additional cost for the administration of the latter bureau will be substantially only the amount required for salaries of 500 or less clerks. The aggregate salaries of 500 clerks, at an average of \$1,400 a year, would be \$700,000, which, added to the amount carried in the pending appropriation bill, would be \$1,946,540.

Now, if you can ascertain the present cost of the administration of the compensation division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, you can easily determine accurately which bureau will the more economically administer the law. There can be no doubt that by reason of their thorough knowledge of such work and long experience the clerical force of the Pension Bureau can accomplish the work more efficiently and expeditiously at this time. The employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance no doubt will, if kept at the work long enough, become experienced and efficient in the adjudication of compensation or pension claims, but why take the time to educate so many of them at great expense when the work can be done by a capable force already receiving pay for similar work and who, with slight increase in number, can take on the combined pension and compensation work of both bureaus?

I thank you, gentlemen. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved eight minutes for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. He was very anxious when we were agreeing upon time to-day to have some time and for the last half hour I have been endeavoring to locate him. But I do not find him in the Chamber. Of course, I now yield those eight minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. But he is not present, as it happens, and I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] first.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, this Bureau of War Risk Insurance has been chewed on here by everybody that wanted a football to kick around, and I have been silent most of the time for the simple reason that I know that the business down there has not been carried on like I thought it should have been carried on, and the letters have not been answered, and matters have not been looked after in a great many instances like I think they should have been. I have also been quite a good deal disgusted because I have found few men who have been responsible for the conduct of the bureau who were willing to take suggestions, but who have been overambitious to have the credit of putting the thing over; but I realize that it has been one of the greatest tasks in the Government, and I have not publicly criticized them, as I have tried to hold myself in a helpful attitude at all times. I think that now we have a director who, if given support, will bring the whole bureau up to an efficient standard soon. But I find that about 75 per cent of the criticism of this bureau is a senseless criticism. It is a criticism by men who do not know the provisions of this law, just like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], who has just taken his seat.

He said in the beginning that he did not understand that certain things were contained in this bill when the law was passed. That is not the only thing that he does not understand about this law, as he evidenced in his statement here. He says that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, except the compensation end, would cease soon after the war closed, and that the Bureau of Insurance will lapse or be taken into some old-line insurance company.

That is exactly in the teeth of everything that the movers of this legislation expected of it. Everybody knows who has ever read the law with understanding that the Government insurance is not only for the dead soldiers and their beneficiaries, not only for the crippled and maimed soldiers and those whose health has been impaired in the Army to such an extent that they can not get other insurance in a private company, but it will be carried on for all who have been in the Army. It would be merciless indeed to turn them out upon the world by discontinuing the insurance where they can not get insurance after their insurability has been destroyed by their service in the Army. Not only that, but in order to keep this insurance section a going concern, we have provided that the insurance shall go on as to every man in the Army who at this time has taken out insurance and wants to carry it on.

Of course the gentleman from Michigan did not understand, either, when he said that this insurance would mount higher and

higher each year until it would become prohibitive. He does not seem to understand that a provision is in the law to the effect that this renewable yearly term insurance is not to be carried on after the war is over, but that every policy that any soldier carries in this insurance section is to be converted within five years into some other kind of insurance. Everybody that knows anything about insurance knows that yearly term renewable insurance is the cheapest insurance in the world that a young man can get, and he knows that in the long run it becomes prohibitive, because it is the highest and most costly insurance in the world.

Now, the proposition indeed was up here to transfer the compensation end of this law to the Pension Office. Reasons were given here why it should not be done. More generous provisions have been made for the crippled and maimed soldiers in this law than has ever been made before in the history of this or any other Government, and the Pension Department of this Government—as every fair man knows who will speak the truth and will listen to it—has become the football of politics in many districts of this country and has become a stench in the nostrils of a lot of people.

That is one reason why we did not put this compensation under the administration of the Pension Office. We tried to make it generous enough then. We believed that we did make it generous enough to take in every man who went into this Army and came out crippled and maimed until he would, more generously than ever before, be taken care of by the Government of the United States, and we tried to fix it so that afterwards we would not have a scandal in Congress, such as we have had in connection with the pensions, of men, making it the football of politics, introducing special bills and by special favors getting them passed, to add to their political prestige at home.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. I would like to ask the gentleman to tell us, if he will, in what respect the Pension Office has become a stench in the nostrils of good people anywhere?

Mr. RAYBURN. I have heard it almost ever since I was able to read that the Pension Office was made the football of politics in this country.

Mr. RUCKER. That must have been away down South, and surely not where soldiers live. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. That is the reason why Congress did not put it in the Pension Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. I would like to have five minutes for myself. I did not intend to speak before.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] out of my own time that I have been reserving for myself.

Mr. RUCKER. I do not want to take it from the gentleman, but I appreciate it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been yielding time that I had reserved for my own use.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of injecting myself into this debate until I heard the remarks just made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], a gentleman for whom I entertain the very highest regard, both as a distinguished Member of this House and a gentleman of high standing. But I will not sit here and allow a man on either side of the House to make such accusations against the administration of the Pension Bureau as were made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] without a reply. I know that comparisons are odious, and they ought to be, but I say to you, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has somewhere, in some remote section of this great Republic of ours, heard murmurs of criticisms of the Pension Office, he has heard here in Washington a tumult of protests against the bureau he helped to create—the War Risk Insurance Bureau. [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Most of the criticisms I have heard since I have come here have been put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RUCKER. In what respect is the Bureau of Pensions a stench in the nostrils of men? It ministers to the wants of the afflicted, it cares for the soldier's widow and her children, and it gives efficient and prompt attention to all matters coming under its jurisdiction.

Oh, the gentleman said something about special bills, and I have heard that on my side of the House before. [Laughter.] Every now and then it is repeated by some gentleman. But why are special pension bills necessary? It is because the existing pension law does not make proper provision for many of the men who suffered bodily injury and impaired health for their country. Our pension laws do not make the same generous provision for soldiers of the Civil War as this Congress, by almost unanimous vote, made for the relief of the National Army, and for that reason those of us who have seen brave, strong, patriotic, and loyal men, seen them in their helplessness, visited them in their humble homes, and witnessed the evidences of misery and want, have come to Congress, in special cases, and asked Congress to be more liberal and generous than it had been, and by special law grant relief that should be granted, and Congress has usually responded favorably. Is that the cause of the stench? Is it possible that in this great land of ours, where in two wars the North and South have locked arms and marched side by side, bearing that flag to victory—is it possible that anywhere in this land to-day there lives a man who still permits the passions of the Civil War to rankle in his bosom?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; but it does seem that if the pension law is not generous enough the gentleman, with gentlemen on his side, will make it so. They will make it so.

Mr. RUCKER. I want to say to this committee that at the time the War Risk Bureau bill was introduced I was one of those who thought the administration of that part of the act relating to compensation, so called, ought to be vested in the Pension Office, and if it had been put there it would have been infinitely more efficiently administered than it is to-day, and I think everybody will admit that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, it has been, and I suppose it will be so often, my unpleasant and painful duty to criticize various departments and bureaus of our Government for their conduct of the war, that it is a pleasure on this occasion to testify to the excellent work and the perfect organization of the Surgeon General's office overseas. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HASKELL] had read the other day a complaint about a case in the Walter Reed Hospital, in Washington. I have no actual information as to this particular hospital or what the Surgeon General's office has been doing in this country during the war, so I asked for a report covering that particular case. I will have the Clerk read the report, which is a full and complete answer to the complaint read into the RECORD the other day. It is but fair to have it before the Members and the country, inasmuch as the other side of the question was presented to the House.

I want to say that our base hospitals overseas were perfect. The work performed by the medical department right near the firing lines was wonderful. The work of our medical corps overseas was a revelation and a lesson to the armies of our allies. It is the one branch that could teach and did not require to learn from others. The sanitary work in our camps kept the disease down to an unprecedented low percentage. The best medical men of the country responded to the call, and fortunately each man was put, as far as practicable, to work for which he has specialized. The medical department of our service overseas came out of this war with a 100 per cent perfect record.

I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD the letters which I have received.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Read them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will ask the Clerk to read the letters.

The letters are as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,  
Washington, January 13, 1919.

Hon. F. H. LAGUARDIA,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LAGUARDIA: With reference to your letter of January 7, in which you inclose a letter from Mr. Jos. J. Lynch and copy of letter addressed to Mr. William A. Graham, all in relation to conditions at the Walter Reed General Hospital, the Surgeon General directs me to inform you that the matter was given prompt and full investigation by one of the distinguished medical authorities on duty in this office, and I am inclosing for your information the complete report, together with the return of all papers forwarded by you.

The return of these papers for file is requested, if convenient, when they have served their purpose.

Very truly, yours,

D. C. HOWARD,  
Colonel, Medical Corps.

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,  
Washington, January 13, 1919.

From: Lieut. Col. Joseph L. Miller, Medical Corps, United States Army.  
To: The Surgeon General, United States Army.  
Subject: Investigation of the treatment of pneumonia at Walter Reed Hospital, Takoma Park, D. C.

1. Pursuant to verbal instructions from the Surgeon General's office, I have read the attached letter of Mr. Joseph J. Lynch and have visited Walter Reed Hospital and conferred with the following-named medical officers and nurses:

Col. E. R. Shriner, commanding officer; Maj. B. H. Randolph, chief of the Medical Service; Maj. D. M. Roberts, assistant chief of Medical Service; Maj. Henry F. Stoll, medical inspector; Capt. D. M. Bloom, assistant adjutant; Capt. C. H. Hayes, receiving officer; Capt. Edward C. Durgin, officer of the day (Dec. 18, 1918); Miss R. Stewart, chief nurse; Miss F. M. Poole, night supervisor of nurses; Miss O. R. Fahl, night nurse on duty, ward 21 (Dec. 18, 1918); Miss Jennie Moore, night nurse on duty, ward 21 (Dec. 18, 1918).

I have furthermore consulted the hospital record of Maj. Thomas M. Lynch and inspected the hospital building where he was placed during his last illness.

2. The hospital record of Maj. Thomas M. Lynch shows that he was admitted to Walter Reed Hospital slightly before midnight of December 17, 1918; that he died at 11.30 p. m., December 18, 1918. The following medical history appears on the record: "Began six days, chills, fever, headache pain. Next day went to work, returned at noon, and since then has been in bed. Symptoms have increased. Cough began and has persisted since. Vomited once in past three days. Much dizziness and very weak from the first." "Patient looks very ill; color bad, with considerable cyanosis, dusky in appearance." "Definite consolidation, dullness, bronchial breathing upper right lobe back and front. Whole back and axilla filled with crackling moist râles." "Examination December 18, 12 noon, patient admitted in a critical condition, color bad, cyanosis and lungs pretty generally filled up." "2.30 p. m., December 18, given intravenously left arm about 150 c. c. citrated blood from influenza-pneumonia patient type I. Patient's blood type I." "4 p. m., patient moved to porch, second floor." "Patient died 11.30 p. m., condition becoming worse and more critical as time passed. Lungs filling more and more."

The hospital record furthermore shows that the patient's temperature on admission was 104°, pulse 100, respiration 32. His drug medication was digitalis, camphorated oil, and strychnine.

3. Col. E. R. Shriner, the commanding officer, stated that there were two medical officers on night duty, and that there was no rule that a medical officer should not be called in case the nurse considered that a patient was worse.

4. Maj. Randolph, chief of the medical service, states that Capt. Keys, the ward surgeon in ward No. 21, reported to him on the morning of December 18, 1918, that a Maj. Lynch, who had been admitted to the hospital on the night previous, was very ill with pneumonia. He requested Capt. Keys to have Maj. Stoll, a specialist in disease of the lungs, see Maj. Lynch.

5. Maj. Henry F. Stoll states that on the morning of December 18, 1918, Capt. Keys informed him that he had a very sick officer, Maj. Lynch, in ward No. 21. Maj. Stoll found Maj. Lynch in a very critical condition, and the physical examination previously cited in this report was written at that time by Capt. Keys. He furthermore reports that the patient was stuporous and could only be aroused with difficulty. Capt. Keys was the ward surgeon in charge of Maj. Lynch, but he is now temporarily absent from the hospital on sick report.

6. Maj. D. M. Roberts, assistant chief of the medical service, was called to the phone by the adjutant and talked to Mr. John Lynch over the long-distance phone on the morning of December 18, 1918. Mr. Lynch asked about his brother's condition, and requested him in case additional nurses were required or an outside medical consultant to make such arrangements and he, Mr. Lynch, would see that the bills were paid. Maj. Roberts does not recall that Mr. Lynch stated that in case it was necessary he would bring nurses with him from New York. Maj. Roberts informed Mr. Lynch that he would communicate at once with the ward surgeon regarding Maj. Lynch. This he did, and Capt. Keys reported that the patient's condition was very critical.

7. Capt. E. C. Durgin, officer of the day on December 18, 1918, states that he first saw Maj. Lynch about 10.30 p. m. December 18. His brother, Mr. John Lynch, was present. Mr. Lynch asked Capt. Durgin whether he thought oxygen would do any good; he replied that Maj. Lynch was then dying, and oxygen would not benefit him. Mr. Lynch also asked if he thought it might be advisable to secure a medical consultant from New York. Capt. Durgin replied that his brother had at most only a few hours to live, and hence it would not be advisable to send to New York for a consultant. Capt. Durgin stayed with the patient about 40 minutes, and during all this time a nurse was present.

8. Capt. C. H. Hayes, the receiving officer, stated that Mr. John Lynch came to him late in the evening of December 18 and asked him if oxygen could be secured for his brother. Capt. Hayes informed him that this was a matter for the ward surgeon, as it was not his duty. During his conversation with Mr. John Lynch a nurse called up asking Capt. Hayes to inform Mr. Lynch that he had better return to ward No. 21, as his brother was very low. Later that night, after Maj. Lynch had died, Capt. Hayes talked with Mr. Lynch, and he did not criticize the treatment his brother had received, but seemed satisfied that he had received the proper attention.

9. Capt. D. M. Bloom, the assistant adjutant, was questioned regarding the difficulty Mr. Lynch is reported to have had in determining over the long-distance phone whether his brother was in the hospital. The assistant adjutant stated that a period of several hours elapsed after a patient is admitted to the hospitals before lists can be made out from which the adjutant can promptly acquire this data.

10. Miss R. Stewart, chief nurse, reported that nurses were instructed in case a patient developed unfavorable symptoms to communicate at once with the night supervisor, who in turn would give the information to one of the two medical officers always on duty during the night. She also stated that the night supervisor now on duty was extremely careful to communicate with medical officer in case she was informed that a patient had developed any unfavorable symptoms. There had been during December a shortage of nurses, due to inability to secure additional Army or civilian trained nurses.



11. Miss F. M. Poole, the night supervisor, stated that she does not recall any request from the nurse in ward No. 21 regarding Maj. Lynch.

12. Miss F. R. Pahl, the nurse on night duty on the first floor of ward No. 21, recalls having seen Maj. Lynch during the short period when she was called to the second floor to relieve the nurse there at meal time.

13. Miss Jennie Moore was on night duty on the second floor of ward No. 21 when Maj. Lynch was a patient there. She does not recall when he entered the hospital, but recalls distinctly the evening he died. She states that Maj. Lynch's brother reached the hospital about 9 or 10 p. m., December 18, 1918. He asked if a special nurse might be secured for his brother. She replied that she could see if this were possible, and a Miss Kane was sent and remained as special nurse with Maj. Lynch until his death. At no time did Mr. John Lynch suggest or offer her a fee in order to facilitate this request. She does not recall that Mr. Lynch mentioned that his brother had insufficient bedding. In case such a request had been made there were adequate extra blankets in the ward. She does not recall that Mr. Lynch complained that his brother was not receiving proper attention. She also stated that the nurses did not have orders not to disturb the medical officer in case a patient became worse.

14. Miss Kane, the special nurse, is not now at Walter Reed Hospital.

15. Ward No. 21 was visited. It is a three-story brick building, built for a contagious ward. Each floor has a normal capacity for about 12 patients. The first floor is used for sick nurses. The other two floors for sick soldiers. Each floor has single rooms and small wards, the largest with a normal capacity of four beds. An inclosed veranda extends along the south side of the building. This veranda is divided in the middle by a partition. Each section has three double French windows reaching from the floor to the ceiling. The floor is cement. The wards were clean and orderly.

16. The above-mentioned veranda is a most satisfactory place for treating pneumonia patients. It is essential that a very ill pneumonia patient, with rapid respiration, be placed in a current of air in order to assure the carrying away of the expired air before the next inspiration. This is recognized as one of the essentials in the fresh-air treatment of pneumonia.

17. Oxygen at the present time is little used in the treatment of pneumonia. The best authorities consider that it has little if any value. Patients die as the result of the severe toxemia rather than from insufficient oxygen.

18. Few pneumonia patients in private life have a physician call as often as every three hours. With a medical officer always available, and the nurse instructed to call him in case untoward symptoms develop, it would seem that rounds by the physician every three hours would be quite adequate.

19. As shown by the record, Maj. Lynch was carefully examined and treatment along accepted lines promptly instituted. He even had the benefit of the most recent discovery in the treatment of influenza-pneumonia, viz, the use of convalescent serum.

20. This investigation shows that Maj. John Lynch entered the Walter Reed Hospital six days after the onset, critically ill with influenza-pneumonia. He died 24 hours later. The medical attention he received there, both from a diagnostic and therapeutic standpoint, was of the highest character. There is no evidence that the hospital was guilty of neglect.

JOS. L. MILLER.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, so much time has been consumed in the general debate on this bill, and it is so exceedingly important that this House should proceed to pass the pending appropriation bills at an early date, that I trust when we come to the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule gentlemen of the committee will confine themselves as closely as possible to the provisions of the bill. There will, of course, be no disposition on the part of anyone to prevent a full and thorough discussion of any of the provisions in the bill, but I trust that the debate will be confined to the bill itself.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee which was charged with the duty of preparing this bill was probably faced with the most difficult task that has ever been faced by any subcommittee that has had charge of a similar bill. This bill makes an appropriation for services of certain employees of the Government for the fiscal year immediately following the war, and it was manifestly impossible for the heads of the departments and the heads of the different bureaus in the city of Washington to state with any particular definiteness how much they would need in their governmental activities while we are passing from a war to a peace basis. Your committee, therefore, I say, have had considerable difficulty in arriving at just what sums will be needed during the next fiscal year. There may be cases in this bill where too much has been appropriated, although I doubt that very much. There are probably in the bill items where possibly too little has been appropriated for the next fiscal year; but your committee was not unmindful of the fact that in such cases, as the year progresses and the work necessary in the departments develops, Congress will be in a better position to judge accurately at the next session in December, and if additional money is needed can provide it by way of a deficiency bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Does the gentleman think that statement refers to the salaries of Congressmen?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was referring more particularly to the salaries of some of the more poorly paid Government employees.

I want to refer specially to the services rendered by my colleagues upon the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and the gentleman

from Iowa [Mr. GOON]. They have rendered very long, faithful, and arduous services in the preparation of this bill.

The committee went into session in hearings upon the estimates submitted on this bill on November 20, and for weeks was engaged constantly during the day and in many night sessions in holding hearings, endeavoring to ascertain the facts necessary for the proper preparation of this bill. We had presented to us requests for general increases of salaries, ranging from positions of assistant secretaries in departments, from \$5,000 to \$7,500, down to \$2,000 and less, increases which amounted to more than \$900,000 for this bill alone. These increases were not submitted to Congress under the law which requires that original estimates shall be submitted through the Secretary of the Treasury to the Speaker, and thence transmitted to the proper committees, but they were submitted by way of supplemental estimates, no reason being assigned as to why they were not submitted in the original estimates. In addition to that, every department requested that increases be given to what may be called the mechanical force of the particular department.

I am not able to tell you just how much those increases would have amounted to, because no estimates were submitted and no data given the committee as to the number to which it would apply and as to how much the aggregate sum would be. Your committee felt that it was impossible on an appropriation bill, and particularly at the short session of Congress, to undertake such an investigation as would justify it in reporting a general salary increase bill to this Congress. In addition to that, in so far as the mechanical help of the departments is concerned, you will recall that this House has passed what is known as the Nolan minimum-wage bill, and that bill is now pending in the Senate. If it is the desire of Congress to raise the mechanical help and the lower-paid help of the departments to a rate of not less than \$3 a day, it is very easy, of course, for the Senate to take that bill up and pass it, and if signed by the President it would become a law, the House having already acted. The result is that your committee has not recommended any general increases of salary in this bill. There are a very few that have been increased, and we will come to them as we proceed with the reading of the bill. In order to meet the demand—and there is a general demand—for increases of salary among a great many of the employees of the Government, and do what I think is common justice to the employees of this Government, the committee has recommended the creation of a joint commission to make investigation, conduct such hearings as are necessary, and report to Congress with reference to a reclassification and readjustment of the salaries paid to employees.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. When you reported this bill you took it for granted that the Senate would pass the Nolan bill; otherwise you would have recommended an increase?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I do not want to leave the gentlemen under that impression, because I have no information as to what the Senate will do with reference to the Nolan bill. As I stated, it was manifestly impossible for this committee at the short session to undertake to go fully into what is being paid to the employees of this Government, as compared with what is being paid for similar services in private employment, not only here in the District of Columbia but throughout the country. And in addition to that, even if that investigation had been made and the committee had determined there were salaries which ought to be increased, it was impossible to include them on an appropriation bill under the rules of the House, because they would have been subject to a point of order. The point I make with reference to the Nolan bill is this: The House has passed the Nolan bill, and it is now pending in the Senate. If it is the desire of Congress to give to all employees of the Government not less than \$3 a day as a minimum wage, it will be very easy for the Senate to take that bill up and pass it.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I fully agree with the gentleman in this proposition to create a commission. I think this thing ought to be looked into thoroughly, so that we can arrive at some understanding to do those people justice.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am very glad the gentleman has made that statement. As a matter of fact, there has been no general reclassification and readjustment of salaries since about 1850.

Mr. LAZARO. And it ought to be done.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And the gentleman well says, it ought to be done.

Mr. DENISON. What is the provision for the commission?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It provides for the appointment of a joint commission of 10, 5 Senators to be appointed by the Vice President, who shall be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and 5 Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, who shall also be Members of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and appropriates \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to provide this commission with proper clerical assistance. While I am on the subject of salaries I might say that the committee has recommended to the House a continuance of the provision of \$120 a year which is carried in the current law and with which all of you are familiar.

The estimates submitted to the committee for this bill amounted to \$120,017,637.63. The total appropriations made for the current fiscal year amount to \$89,182,145.98, and this bill which is recommended to the House carries a total of \$96,306,891.75, or about \$7,000,000 more than the appropriation for the current year. That increase is made up of two items which were not considered in the current bill, or at least an increase of one item, and a new item. This bill carries \$15,000,000 for the taking of the next census, which will begin January 1, 1920, and it carries an appropriation of several million dollars more than is carried in the current law for the collection of internal revenue. If these items are taken from the bill, this bill would really be a considerable reduction over the expenses for the current year.

It is not my purpose to undertake a discussion of this bill in detail. That can best be done as we proceed with the reading of the bill. I wanted to call attention to a few of the main outstanding features of the bill. We have provided, as I stated, \$15,000,000 for the taking of the next census. That is not all that the Director of the Census says will be necessary. He submitted an estimate to the committee for \$20,500,000, which would be sufficient to entirely take the census, according to his figures, and would also provide for the permanent force of the census for a period of three years.

But he stated in the hearings that it would be impossible to expend more than \$15,000,000, if that much, during the next fiscal year, and your committee was unwilling to recommend an appropriation for an amount that was admittedly more than he could possibly expend during the period of this bill. This bill carries an appropriation of \$4,000,000 by way of lump sum for the War Department, which is a considerable reduction over the current law and also a considerable reduction of the estimates which were submitted.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Were not the estimates submitted by the War Department made up before the signing of the armistice, and were they not figured upon a war-time basis for that department?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. TILSON. Which would necessarily be very much higher than a peace-time basis in the fiscal year 1920?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, but after the signing of the armistice the War Department submitted amended estimates of what they would need during the fiscal year 1920 on a peace basis, and it was to that estimate I referred when I said this was less.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman has reduced the revised estimate of the War Department?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. In other words, the original estimate which was submitted prior to the signing of the armistice, my recollection is, called for \$32,000,000. Now, after the signing of the armistice, the War Department revised this estimate and submitted estimates which called for \$5,940,570, stating that it was expected that that sum would provide for 4,977 additional employees. The amount recommended by the committee, at an average salary of approximately \$1,200, would approximately care for 3,300 persons, or 1,600 less than had been requested. Now, I do not know, I am frank to say, whether that will be sufficient or not. My judgment is that the War Department will find that that sum is entirely sufficient as the fiscal year progresses, although it is certain that The Adjutant General's Office will require a greatly increased force. In this estimate it was stated that The Adjutant General would probably require \$2,900,000 alone. As I say, I do not think as the year progresses any such sum as that will be required, yet the committee felt that if it was mistaken, and if by any chance it did allow too little, Congress would be in session and be better able to pass on what was needed at the next winter session than now, six months prior to the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. MANN. Did not the Secretary of War recently make an estimate asking for \$6,000,000 mainly for additional clerk hire?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; it amounted to \$5,940,000 to be exact.

Mr. MANN. That was after this bill had been—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; that estimate was presented to the committee while it was having its hearings, and we had that estimate before us when the hearings on the War Department were conducted.

Mr. MANN. Well, I think there was an estimate submitted in the last few days of \$6,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, well, the gentleman means for a deficiency; the gentleman refers to a deficiency?

Mr. MANN. That is what I wanted to ask, whether that was for a deficiency for the balance of this fiscal year—\$6,000,000 for additional clerk hire?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is my understanding; but I am frank to say I have not seen the estimate. The estimate referred to by the gentleman is for a deficiency for the remainder of the fiscal year. Now, gentlemen, for the Navy Department this bill carries for additional employees \$1,046,000, which is a reduction from \$1,210,686.73 provided for the current year and a reduction from the estimate submitted to the committee, which was \$1,607,740. The Navy Department at the time our hearings were conducted had in the District of Columbia a total of 6,275 persons, with pay aggregating an annual rate of \$7,729,293.28, which was made up as follows: Statutory employees on the regular roll, 723; total salary, \$818,260; temporary additional employees, 1,263; total salary, \$1,516,260.16; and reserves to the number of 4,289, with a total salary of \$5,354,773.12.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question in regard to the practice of these different departments. You are making appropriations of so much money to pay for the additional help in the War Department, for example, and also in the Navy Department. What I want to know is, What is the practice of those departments? In the event you do not make sufficient appropriations, do the heads of the different departments go right on employing this help they feel they need and then come in with a deficiency appropriation and ask Congress to pay the bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The law provides where a lump sum is provided that it shall be apportioned throughout the year, in 12 equal installments, month by month, but it also gives to the head of the department the authority to waive that law of apportionment where he deems it necessary for the conduct of the Government's business. Of course, therefore, Congress has no authority, unless it repeals that law, to regulate the amount of money that shall be used during the month unless it proceeds in the bill to say how much shall be used month by month.

Mr. McKENZIE. In peace time you provide in this legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill for a certain specific number of clerks, as I understand it, and, of course, the heads of the departments can not add to that number without the authority of Congress, but now during this war time or period is it possible that Congress has not the power to demobilize this great force of clerks down there, but they can go on and keep them on the roll and then come in with a deficiency bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Congress has undoubtedly power to reduce the appropriations, of course, and decline to give permission to employ the clerks. They can not employ them unless they have an appropriation, and this bill, while it carries \$4,000,000 for the War Department, provides for a reduction from the amount of about \$18,000,000 which, I understand, is needed for the current year. So you see that in itself is quite a demobilization.

Mr. McKENZIE. I understand that; but, for instance, the deficiency the gentleman just spoke of a few moments ago, which the Secretary of War is asking for, is to pay for help. Now, the appropriation is a certain amount of money?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. When that was exhausted they do not keep taking on clerks, I understand, but come in with a deficiency?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; the original appropriation was something over \$10,000,000, but, as I stated, under the law the Secretary of War had the right to waive the necessity of apportioning that money month by month where an emergency arose which, in his opinion, warranted such action, and I assume that was so in this case.

Mr. McKENZIE. He can do the same thing under this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He can.



Now, it appears that the Navy Department expects to continue the employment of a force of 2,572 reserves, even though they were allowed the 1,785 additional employees which were asked of Congress in this bill. For my part, gentlemen, I think it is a bad practice to employ reserves in peace times here in Washington to perform clerical service. I think that work ought to be done by civilians. But since it was stated that 2,572 reserves were to be employed anyway, and since your committee had no jurisdiction of legislation with reference to the employment of reserves here in the Navy Department, your committee felt thoroughly warranted in reducing this sum to a little over a million dollars for about 800 employees.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. I was wondering whether in the face of the fact that the Navy Department has decided under the Naval Establishment to retain 2,500 reserves as clerks if it would not be a good thing to cut out all the civilian clerks and let them run the department with reserves, inasmuch as this committee has no jurisdiction to do anything else?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think that would be advisable if it was proper to employ reserves in peace times.

Mr. MADDEN. I know; but inasmuch as this committee has no jurisdiction to direct the removal of reserves, and the department insists on retaining them, and at the same time insists on the employment of civilian clerks, if there is no other way around to reach the matter of the economical administration of the affairs of the department this committee could refuse to appropriate for the civilian clerks until they found out when the department was going to let go of the reserves.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think what Congress ought really to do is to refuse to provide for the reserves.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman said they had no jurisdiction over them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And they should require the Navy Department to submit estimates here as to the extent of the clerical force they would need during the fiscal year.

Mr. MADDEN. Would the gentleman raise a point of order against an amendment that would do that in this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To cut out the reserves?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The reserves are not carried in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand; but we might put a provision in this bill that would prevent their being carried any other place.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I would feel compelled at the present time to say I would for this reason: They evidently have not estimated here for anything like the force that will be needed by the Navy Department, and I think if we were first to cut out the reserves, without giving the Navy Department an opportunity to come before some committee to show the civilian force they need, it might do the department an injustice.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought, maybe, that if we could eliminate the reserves that are acting as clerks in the department, and we did not leave enough civilian clerks to do the work, we could supply them in the bill before it got through the Senate.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state of what these reserves consist? Are they men or women, or both?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They consist of both sexes, but the majority are women.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know as a matter of fact that they get more pay than civil-service employees?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I understand that many of them do.

Mr. DYER. The employees who have been there for years are getting less pay than these reserves.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think that is true in some instances. That is another reason why I think the employment of reserves in peace times in the Navy Department should be abandoned.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. EMERSON. I find in this bill in several places provisions for the employment of people by name. Why is that in the bill? Now, for instance, in the Senate I find Henry M. Rose, at \$5,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Where is that?

Mr. EMERSON. That is on page 2; Henry M. Rose, \$5,000, and on page 17, for the employment of Joel Grayson in the document room.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is due to the fact that Congress many years ago—I do not know just when—passed a joint resolution placing those particular men on the rolls at the sal-

aries named in the bill, and hence the appropriations in the bill are framed to take care of them by name because they were named in the joint resolution.

Mr. EMERSON. They are permanently employed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are permanently employed until Congress sees fit to repeal the resolution.

I want to hurriedly refer to two or three matters. We have included in this bill a provision in reference to war materials so as to provide that the excess materials and supplies in the various departments which have accumulated on account of the war may be used by other departments.

The President issued an Executive order covering these excess general supplies into the custody and care of the General Supply Committee, and the provision that we have recommended makes provision for their sale by this General Supply Committee to the departments and bureaus of the Government that may need them.

This bill undertakes to eliminate all the provisions for rent that are being made here in the District of Columbia, with the exception of certain buildings which are under lease by the Government. There are a number of buildings like the building occupied by the Department of Labor, the Civil Service Commission, and other establishments, which are under lease for a period of years. Some of these leases run to 1921, 1922, and 1923. Of course, in these cases it is necessary for the Congress to make an appropriation to carry out the terms of the leases.

Then there is another building the lease of which expires June 30. That is the building occupied by the Department of Commerce. Your committee felt that it was hardly in accordance with the dignity of that great department to undertake to put it in one of these temporary wooden buildings down here in the park, and hence we have recommended to Congress that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to enter into another lease for five years at the end of the present term of the lease. But with the exception of a few other buildings which appear in the bill, this committee has eliminated all the rent, amounting to more than \$600,000, that is being paid private owners here in Washington.

It was stated by Mr. Dorr, who has charge of this matter, that the total net space available in temporary buildings is 3,994,000 square feet. He has received requests from certain activities of the Government for 761,000 square feet, which will be taken care of by June 30 of this year, and he estimates that after all these requests are taken care of he will then have an additional 500,000 square feet which will be available for assignment to other branches of the Government.

Your committee felt, inasmuch as these buildings are suitable for office purposes, and inasmuch as they will be vacant, it would be a waste and an extravagance to undertake to rent private buildings here in the city of Washington when the Government has sufficient available space to take care of all its business, and hence, as I say, we eliminated more than \$600,000 in rent from this bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MANN. What buildings does the gentleman refer to? He said "these buildings." What buildings does he refer to?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Government buildings?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have reference to these temporary buildings down here in Henry and Seaton Parks and in the Mall, and then also to a number of buildings, the Food Administration Building and the Fuel Administration Building, which are down near Potomac Park, and the War Trade Building, which is on Government land on Fourteenth Street.

Mr. MANN. I take it that the position of the gentleman and of the committee is that these temporary buildings which were put up in parks are to remain there?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. The committee recognized full well that it will be impossible for these buildings to be occupied more than a few years, because they are temporary in character.

Mr. MANN. They are temporary in character, of course, and they may fall down, and can not be used very long; but in the meantime they can repair them and keep them up. I had hoped that the committee or Congress would attempt at the very earliest possible moment to restore the parks and tear down these temporary buildings just as fast as they could get the people out.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I feel sure that many of these buildings will be torn down, even if this provision goes in, eventually, because they will not all be needed.

Mr. MANN. Just those that are needed will remain. But the Government activities are such, the demand for space is such,

that as soon as any portion of the Government, the Congress or the House of Representatives, and any one of the various departments finds that there is additional space that can be obtained they always want to occupy more room. There never will be space enough created for the Government to satisfy the desire of people for more room. We have had experience of that in connection with our own offices.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I thought that possibly if this provision were adopted it might serve to aid some gentlemen who are endeavoring to have the Government put up more buildings. For my part I have always thought it was a shame that the Government of the United States, rich and powerful as it is, did not own its own buildings and house its employees under its own roof, and I hope the time will come soon when we will have buildings of that character. And when I say that, I do not mean buildings that are put up under the artistic ideas of the Fine Arts Commission, with many expensive columns and little office space, but I mean substantial, good-looking, respectable office buildings.

Mr. EMERSON. And have them grouped together where we can get to them.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I remember hearing Mr. Fitzgerald, of the Committee on Appropriations, discussing this matter on the floor here, and the point was raised at that time about building these buildings in the Mall or in the parks; and he stated that it was the purpose of the committee and its members, so far as he could tell, that they should be only temporary, and should be torn down just as soon as the emergency was over. Is that still the idea of the committee, so far as you know it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is a matter, of course, with which the committee of which I am a member has nothing to do. But I think that is the idea of every Member of Congress, because these buildings are in their very character temporary, although it is stated that some of them might last 5 or 10 years. I see no reason why some of them should be torn down during the next fiscal year, and certainly economy demands that the Government should use them as long as they stand.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. They are in a place where they ought not to be. Is not that true?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, possibly of one or two buildings, but buildings like the Food Administration Building and the Fuel Administration Building and other buildings near Potomac Park do not interfere with any of the parks of the Government. As a matter of fact, they are constructed on leased land, for which the Government is paying 10 cents a square foot per annum.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I imagine it is the intention to move some of the other departments of the Government into these temporary buildings. Is it also intended to move the records of these various activities into these buildings?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There will be no particular permanent records of great value. There will be no records of such value as those of the War Risk Bureau or the Internal Revenue Service. Departments which have a great volume of records will not be moved there, I take it. The question of what branches of the Government will be moved into these buildings is left with the President.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. In other words, there will not be anything taken into these buildings, so far as the gentleman knows, that would be exposed to the hazards of destruction by fire?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, no; quite the contrary, I am sure. The Committee has recommended to Congress that the Arlington Building, so called, which is now nearing completion and, I understand, will be ready about February 1, shall be used by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and if there is any excess space, that the Secretary of the Treasury may designate it for other bureaus of the department. Now, representatives of the bureau appeared before the committee and asked for an appropriation of \$40,000 to rent the Southern Railway Building, down here near the depot, stating that it was the only building within their knowledge which they could rent which was of fireproof construction. We did not allow that; but inasmuch as it was stated to the House when the Arlington Building was purchased out of the emergency fund of the President, and in the hearing before the Senate committee that it was purchased for the War Risk Bureau, we felt that the War Risk Bureau should be put into that building, especially since, as has been stated on the floor this morning, it is now spread out in 15 buildings over the city, and that is one of its chief excuses, and I think justified to a certain extent, for its failure

to render the prompt service that we all hoped it would render in the case of allotments and allowances.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. SLOAN. Did Congress ever authorize the investment of its funds in this Arlington Hotel property, so called?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The \$4,200,000 which was used in purchasing that building was set apart by the President out of the emergency fund which Congress had theretofore placed in the hands of the President.

Mr. SLOAN. That emergency fund was distinctively a war-chest fund and not a real estate or construction fund.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was an emergency fund for war purposes undoubtedly. There are many purposes to which it might have been legally and properly devoted by the President, and I assume this is one of them.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Did not Congress subsequently take some action touching this matter?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think not, although it was discussed in the House.

Mr. GARNER. They reimbursed the \$4,200,000, did they not?

Mr. STAFFORD. When did they ever do that?

Mr. GARNER. I am asking the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think they ever took such action. In fact, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] was ready to introduce a rule to consider the resolution providing for the purchase of that building when Mr. McAdoo went ahead and purchased it out of this fund.

Mr. GARNER. I think they reimbursed that.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What is the gentleman's recollection about that? My own recollection is that Congress subsequently authorized the reimbursement of this fund out of which the President had made the payment, and thereby ratified and indorsed what Mr. McAdoo did.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am frank to say to the gentleman that I am not certain that any such action was taken. I do know that the matter was very thoroughly discussed upon the floor of the House, but I do not recall that Congress passed a bill appropriating \$4,200,000 for the purpose of reimbursing the President's fund.

Mr. EMERSON. The Government paid for it, just the same, whether out of the President's fund or some other fund.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is paid for, and, to my mind, it is one of the finest buildings that the Government owns here in the city, with one or two exceptions. It is a splendid building, and I have no doubt is fully worth the money paid for it. It contains something over 600,000 square feet of space, and will be more than sufficient to house this great War Risk Bureau.

Now, gentlemen, while I am discussing the War Risk Bureau and the space that has been provided for it, I wish to refer to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois the other day read into the Record a number of letters, some of them attacking certain officials in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, one of them in particular undertaking to name three of the employees of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, to wit, Mr. King, whose initials I do not recall; Mr. Effner, whom I do not know; and Mr. D. A. Jones, who is superintendent of special agents. Mr. King is now a deputy commissioner. Criticism was made in this letter—the gentleman from Illinois expressly stated he did not vouch for the accuracy of the statement—of these gentlemen for having selected what was known as the Hooper-Holmes Bureau to make the investigations required by law as to the allotments and allowances.

This letter intimated, if it did not expressly say so, that the three gentlemen to whom I have referred stood to make a good deal of money as a result of the methods that they had followed in selecting this bureau to make these investigations. I understand full well, as I say, that the gentleman from Illinois did not vouch for that statement. I regret that he did not give the author of the letter, because if he had it might be possible to show—I do not know whether it is the fact or not—that the author of the letter was one of two or three employees who have been discharged from the bureau. But whether that be true or not, I wish to say, in justice to these gentlemen, that I do not think any criticism can be made of them for the manner in which they have selected these special agents to make these investigations. I have known Mr. D. A. Jones for many years; I have known his family, and I can cheerfully testify to his high character and integrity. He is a reputable, splendid gentleman, who came here in a clerical capacity, and who by virtue of his own industry and efficiency has been promoted to be superintendent of investigations in the bureau. As to Mr. King, I never knew him until he appeared before the committee in the hearings. He impressed me then as a man of fine



business capacity, and all who know him speak well of him. He is connected in some way—just how I do not know—with the Hooper-Holmes Bureau. I do not know Mr. Effner. The facts are that they were under the necessity of making this investigation under the law. Here were hundreds of thousands of cases all over the country.

They had sent checks for allotments and allowances, because, of course, they realized they could not delay sending out checks to families of soldiers who needed the money while they undertook these many investigations. The question was as to how they should select those to make investigations in every town and in every civil district of the country. More than 110,000 investigators were selected. They appealed to insurance inspection agencies, they appealed to the Red Cross, they appealed to every conceivable source for a list of men capable of making these investigations. They took a list of the American Bar Association and sent a letter, I am informed, to every member of the American Bar Association telling him that while they knew he would not be particularly interested in the \$1 which was all that was paid for any particular case, yet it was hoped, from the standpoint of patriotism and desire to serve the country, that he would assist in such investigations. Many of them did it as a pure matter of patriotism, because the sum of \$1 was not sufficient compensation for the work required in many of these cases. Out of the 110,000 investigators on the rolls, they tell me, 60,000 are active, and I am informed that representatives of the Hooper-Holmes Bureau are serving in only about five States. I submit that in cases where only \$1 is paid for an investigation, where the fee is not paid by either one of these three gentlemen, but is paid through the disbursing officer of the bureau, there is not the slightest opportunity for either one of them, if so inclined, to profit at the expense of the Government in the investigation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The statements which I read in the House were read some time ago. They could easily be denied if they were not true. The gentleman has not denied any of them yet. I have been appealed to by various gentlemen not to press anything of this kind, because some of these gentlemen were members of the Republican Club of New York, in good standing in the club. It seemed to me, instead of endeavoring to bring political influence to bear upon me, which usually does not have very much effect, they would better deny the statements. Is Mr. King a high official in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; he has been acting as deputy commissioner.

Mr. MANN. Is he a high official in connection with the Hooper-Holmes Bureau?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is my information.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman knows the transaction is improper if he had anything to do with it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know this, without undertaking to argue the propriety of Mr. King having been employed as a deputy commissioner and then employing the investigators of his bureau to make these investigations; I feel sure that there has not been any graft to those in charge here in Washington in these investigations throughout the country, for this reason: In the first place, it has been difficult, I am informed, to even get men to make these investigations for \$1, because they insist that it is worth four or five times that much. In addition to that, I am told that when these reports come in they are first submitted to those in charge of the investigation section, and if they are found to be proper and the person making the report has complied with the instructions of the bureau, then his name is certified to the disbursing office and a check for the amount due is sent directly to him. I submit that in order for anyone here in Washington to profit it would be necessary to have some arrangement with the whole 60,000 investigators over the country for a refund of a part of the dollar that might be sent him in this or that case.

Mr. MANN. If the Hooper-Holmes Bureau is making a large amount of money out of this and Mr. King as deputy commissioner of this bureau was instrumental in having that company get the work in which he is interested, I can very readily see an opportunity of making considerable money whether it is called graft or otherwise. As to whether the investigations which have been made are worth \$1, that is another thing. I doubt whether any investigation is made in most of these cases that is worth 5 cents. I happen to know of some cases where I know the investigations took no time and it is not worth a nickel.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed that as a result of these investigations about \$900,000 per month remains in the Treasury.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, I suppose, means that a lot of those allowances have been revoked, namely, upon reports made directly to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and in most cases it has been an outrageous revocation.

Mr. GARNER. Not in most cases.

Mr. MANN. In many cases, without investigation, without knowledge.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman referred to an investigation by Congress. I think that if there is the least scintilla of evidence of facts to support the charge that any employee of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance has been profiting at the expense of the Government and in violation of law and the obligation that he owes to the Government, there ought to be such an investigation and such person punished.

Mr. MANN. If the Deputy Commissioner of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance has given a contract to a concern of which he is substantial owner, and which receives a large amount of money from the Government, it certainly means that somebody is getting some money out of the Government.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am informed by Mr. King—I give the gentleman as my authority—that the Hooper-Holmes Co. does not receive one cent of the \$1 that has been paid to those making these investigations. The Government pays the money direct to the investigator, who is expected to make a close and personal investigation of the cases placed in his hands, and which often requires a good deal of work and the interviewing of a number of persons. Gentlemen must bear in mind that this investigation is required by law, and these officials have been trying to do their duty.

And I hold in my hand a memorandum which was handed me by Mr. King, and also one handed me by Mr. D. A. Jones, which they asked me to do them the justice to present to the House. These gentlemen specifically deny these charges, and I wish them to go into the RECORD so that their side of the matter may be made clear.

Mr. MANN. Do I understand the gentleman says that no money is paid by the Government to the Hooper-Holmes Co.?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; if I said that I was very unfortunate in my statement.

Mr. MANN. I understood it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. What I meant to say was, I am informed by Mr. King that the Hooper-Holmes Bureau receives no part of the money that is paid to any of its agents for making this investigation.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; but is the gentleman also informed that the Hooper-Holmes Co. does not pay the dollar to the agent?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For making this investigation?

Mr. MANN. But only pays a portion of it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The dollar is paid by the Government.

Mr. MANN. To the Hooper-Holmes Co.?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; my information is it is paid directly to the man making the investigation, and the voucher is sent him and not to the Hooper-Holmes Bureau.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman has stated both ways about it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I have been unfortunate. I stated a few moments ago—

Mr. MANN. There is quite a difference in whether the Government is given an opportunity to use the list of people which the Hooper-Holmes Co. has as its own list and pays the men itself or whether the Government has made an arrangement with the Hooper-Holmes Co. and pays the Hooper-Holmes Co. a dollar for each case and the Hooper-Holmes Co. pays a portion of that amount to the men making the investigation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My information is that the Government is only using the list of the Hooper-Holmes Bureau in certain States where they were unable to secure lists through the usual method and that the money which is paid for making the investigation is not paid to the Hooper-Holmes Bureau but paid to each individual who makes this investigation and the report.

Mr. MANN. It is a very easy matter to determine. Why has it not been determined? The letter which I read to the House, which might be supplemented by a statement made to me by a Member of the House who said he had investigated this matter, was that the Hooper-Holmes Co. received a dollar, and whereas it usually had a great many employees working in other insurance cases it did not pay the dollar to the investigator, and that in other insurance cases it took a contract for making the investigation for less than a dollar and still retained a profit after paying the investigator. Now, it is easy to know what the facts are.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I repeat I have here, Mr. Chairman, a statement of Mr. King in the form of a memorandum

which he requested me to present to the House, and I ask unanimous consent to insert this, and also a memorandum from Mr. D. A. Jones, in the Record as a part of my remarks, which will give the gentleman the full information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does Mr. King say anything about the point suggested by my colleague in his memorandum?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; and explains the whole matter.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Why can not it be read now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If you will give me the time I will be glad to read it, but I have not the time, and I was trying to get through so as to yield to the gentleman from Texas the balance of my time. I think it will serve every purpose if it is printed in the Record.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman also place in the Record the questionnaire submitted to the various investigators or inspectors, whatever they may be, relative to the right of these beneficiaries to these allotments? I understand that the questions submitted were, at least some of them, subject to criticism. For instance, in a number of them, and I appeal to the gentleman from Ohio for a definite statement, if a mother was claiming allotment from a son the investigator would ask whether or not she was a moral woman, or words to that effect?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have never had an opportunity to see one of the questionnaires, and I do not know just what statements are contained in them.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it they were made sufficiently broad in order to give all the information that was necessary for the bureau to act properly on the case. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. I had sent to my home town, addressed to me as attorney at law, 8 or 10 questionnaires, wanting information relative to a number of allottees in that particular neighborhood. I happened to know personally two of them myself—two mothers. The letter inclosed asked me to state in the place for remarks on each questionnaire whether or not these mothers were moral women. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee what would be the difference whether a mother was moral or not if she had sent two or three sons into the Army and those sons had made an allotment to her. The money belonged to the boys and not to the Government. The Government had agreed with those boys when they left their homes to pay this allotment to the mother, and I could not quite understand what business it was of the department whether the mother happened to be a good woman or a bad woman. The sons wanted her to have the money or they would not have allotted it to her. It was their money.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Is the gentleman certain that that was only an allotment, and that it did not carry with it an allowance?

Mr. KEARNS. It carried with it an allowance, yes, in this particular instance. The two sons had gone in November, 1917. It was only a few weeks ago that I received this letter and these questionnaires. This mother had not received even one nickel up to that time. It seems to me if the Government was not satisfied to pay the allowance it ought at least to have paid the \$30 that belonged to the sons of this mother, regardless of whether she was a moral woman or not.

Now, in this particular instance to which I refer, because this mother could not get this money from her sons, who had been supporting her for the last six or seven years, to my knowledge, she was compelled to take in washing and do the family laundry for a number of families in this town. She was thus compelled to be away from home through the day, when she was at work, and one of her younger boys caught cold playing in the streets, with no one to look after him, and died. Certainly some one in the department is responsible for that young son's death. I happened to know of this case, and when I got the questionnaires I wrote to the department answering their questions as best I could, but when it came to the place where it asked whether she was moral or not, I wrote in that place "It is none of your d—business"; and the mother informed me in a week after that she had received the allotment and allowance.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I have had many cases called to my attention which I thought were inexcusable, but, on the whole, I think we should take everything into consideration. Here are 4,000,000 applications for allotment and allowance to the War Risk Bureau, a bureau that did not grow gradually, but where all the allowances and allotments were thrust on it

at one time. Possibly there may be a little justification for the delay. Gentlemen can appreciate what a stupendous job it was and how very difficult it was not to make some mistakes.

Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of this bill your committee has borne constantly in mind the importance and necessity of retrenching the expenditures of the Government. The expenses incident to the preparation for and the winning of the war were without precedent in the history of this or any other country. Congress, with an eye single and alone upon an early and lasting victory spared no expense necessary to enable those charged with the prosecution of the war to thoroughly equip our soldiers who were so bravely risking their lives in the cause of freedom not only for our own beloved country but for the world at large. During the war money was spent with a lavish hand, and not a single loyal taxpayer complained or would have had it otherwise. A heavy bonded indebtedness which will require years to liquidate was willingly incurred in order that militarism and autocracy might forever perish from the earth. But now the scene has changed. The war has been won. It has cost the lives of many of the noblest and best of our citizenship, and billions in money. But, Mr. Chairman, independence is never purchased at too great a sacrifice. Every true American, not excepting the noble mother who made the supreme sacrifice of her splendid son on the altars of her country, has been willing to make the sacrifice in order to maintain our commercial independence and complete sovereignty and to rid the world of the nightmare of military domination and economic servitude.

This war has taught us many valuable lessons. Chief among them, I trust, is the lesson of frugality, the importance of conserving our food supplies and resources, and the sin of wastefulness and wanton extravagance. On account of our great abundance, the American people had become an extravagant people, wasting vastly more of the actual necessities of life each year than was necessary for their comfort and pleasure. The necessities of war have brought this fact home to the man and woman both on the farm and in the city. And, Mr. Chairman, what is true of the individual should be true of our Government. Our appropriations for years to come will be many times greater than ever before on account of the war, and this increased burden will rest upon the people whom we represent. The time has come when the representatives of the people must give closer attention to the expenditures made by the Government. This does not mean that our Government must be parsimonious. It certainly does not mean that those who are employed by the Government shall not receive a wage which will fairly compensate them for the services rendered and enable them not only to live comfortably and decently but to also have some of the real and genuine pleasures of life. It does not mean that the Government shall be unprogressive and fail to make those expenditures which are necessary for the health, happiness, and education of its people. It does not mean that it shall in any way neglect those internal improvements which are so necessary for its complete development or that it shall fail to fully foster and lend proper encouragement to agriculture, industry, and commerce. Quite the contrary. For these are duties which must be assumed by a Government which exists for the people and not for a few favored individuals. But it does mean, Mr. Chairman, that the expenditures of the Government must be closely scrutinized and that all wasteful and unnecessary expenditures must be eliminated. This your committee has very earnestly endeavored to do in the preparation of this bill.

Some increases made necessary by the developments of the war have been recommended. Among them is an increase for the promotion of our commerce, both foreign and domestic. I am frank to say that personally I would have been willing to see an even greater amount appropriated than is recommended in this bill, for I regard this as a matter of the most vital importance to the prosperity of all the people and particularly at this time. Every dollar that is properly expended for the extension of our foreign commerce at this time will be wisely spent. We are not spending near so much for this purpose as Germany was spending before the war, and we all know that the products of her factories and industries had invaded every country in the world, and that if she had only been content, and had not sought to dominate the world by the force of her arms, she would very soon have become supreme, commercially, over all other nations. This substantial and worth-while peaceful victory would have been secured through the aid which her government was giving to her industries in foreign fields. Neither are we spending as much as Great Britain, which will be our chief, though friendly, trade rival of the future. Nor, I dare say, will we be spending more than Canada, whose statesmen are already planning a world-wide campaign for the exploitation of her products. The nation that does not prepare



now for the fierce trade rivalry that is bound to ensue, and that does not take proper and necessary steps to secure a large part of the world's trade, is making a most serious economic mistake.

It is a matter of the most vital importance to every citizen of our country. The greater our trade, the more factories we will have and the greater the number of laborers who will be employed and the better the wages which will be paid them. Likewise, the greater will be the demand for our agricultural products and the price which will be paid for them. If we, as a Nation, expect to keep our place in the sun, then we must see to it that American-made goods and American products of all kinds find their way into all the markets of the world. In the future a nation's greatness very happily will not be measured by the size of its army or the strength of its naval armament, but by its commercial strength. The true test will not consist in the number of its naval vessels and its big guns, but rather in the number of its factories.

The opportunities have never been greater or more inviting than they are at this time. The eyes of the whole world are upon America. Her vast resources have become known to every nation on the globe. Her ability to produce, "to deliver the goods," has been demonstrated to a wondering world, and no one will be heard to question her ability to successfully cross swords with every rival in the forceful struggle for a large share of the world's trade. If this is to be secured, then proper steps must be taken now. We must not wait until other nations have satisfied the waiting markets made hungry by the war and thus established a trade which may prove permanent. The devastated regions of Europe offer an inviting field for our products. The same may be said of the neutral countries of Europe whose stock of supplies has run low. Germany, by reason of the activity of commercial agents and her manufacturers, had a great trade with South America and the Orient. The fortunes of war have lost this to her. Shall we permit this trade to be taken by other countries, or shall we reach out and take it as we can do by reason of our vast and varied resources, which are superior to those of any other nation on the globe? To do this we must adopt the plan that Germany followed with such great commercial and financial success, and which other nations are planning to follow, and send experienced and competent commercial agents into promising foreign fields, not to act as sales agents, but to study foreign market conditions and requirements, and to give advice and information to our manufacturers as to how they can best meet such conditions and compete with other countries. We are spending millions of dollars in building the largest merchant marine in the world. These bottoms, filled with American commodities, agricultural and industrial, should enter every market of the world, bringing back in return those elements of wealth which will contribute to the prosperity of our entire citizenship. I regard it as a sad commentary that we are to-day spending for this purpose less than one-twentieth of what it costs to build one first-class battle cruiser.

And let me say just here, Mr. Chairman, that every section of our country is equally interested in this vital problem. It is America's opportunity, and not that of any particular section of America. The enrichment of one section adds to the wealth and commercial strength of our common country. The fires of sectional hatred which years ago unfortunately, but somewhat naturally, mounted high, I am happy to believe have been completely extinguished. There is no North, no South, no East, no West in this country except in a geographic sense. And I greatly deplore the fact that there were some in the recent election who for purely political purposes sought to fan the old fires of sectional hatred into flame by the cry that the "South is in the saddle." Such a sentiment was unworthy of the great political party in whose interest it was uttered, and an insult to those to whom it was addressed, in the hope of influencing them. Let me tell you that there is no such feeling in the South. We rejoice that we are an important part of this great Nation and that our brave boys fought by the side of the brave boys of other sections for the glory and honor of our flag. I repeat that an effort to provoke sectional feeling for political purposes is unworthy of the one who attempts it, and I feel sure will be rebuked by the sober, sensible people of all sections of our country.

And let me say, in no spirit of resentment or criticism, that the South has done much to add to the wealth of the North and East. For reasons with which we are familiar she has had comparatively few manufacturing. Her cotton has in large part been shipped hundreds of miles to New England, and there woven into cloth and then distributed over the world. That this has been a serious economic mistake on the part of capital no one will deny, for the South is nearer South America and the markets of Australia and the Orient. The loss on account of unnecessary transportation is therefore considerable, especially

when it is considered that many southern harbors offer ample facilities to steamship lines for the shipment of her valuable products direct to foreign markets. We have the coal, the iron, the water power, the transportation, and other facilities, and with these advantages you may rest assured that factories will soon spring up in the South in greater abundance than ever, and that the increasing whirl of her spindles and factory wheels will make her an ever-growing commercial as well as agricultural factor in the life and wealth of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I append herewith the memoranda to which I have referred.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE,  
Washington, January 6, 1919.

#### MEMORANDUM.

Re Connection of John J. King with the investigation section of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

In June, 1918, the Hooper-Holmes Bureau, a corporation operating under the laws of New York and engaged in furnishing information and inspection service to insurance companies for the past 25 years, received a telegram from C. F. Nesbit, Commissioner Bureau of War Risk Insurance, asking that one of the principals come to Washington for a conference. In pursuance to the request contained in this telegram I came to Washington and had a conference with Mr. Nesbit, Assistant Secretary Love, and others. I remained here four days. I feel that I was practically drafted into the service of the Government, for the reason that upon my first interview with the commissioner he stated that he wanted me to come here for six months to assist in the organization of a central investigation section to replace the work that had already been planned for numerous branch offices and which had already proven unsatisfactory and very expensive. As a result of my conferences during my first visit to Washington, and after a consultation with my business associates in New York, it was agreed that I would come to Washington in an advisory capacity for three days or thereabouts each week, I having stated it was impossible at that time to give the Government my entire time for six months. Early in July I received an appointment as expert adviser to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. About this time Mr. H. A. Behrens, of Chicago, was also called in as an adviser, and was jointly submitted a plan of operation of the investigation section, centralized in Washington, which plan was adopted and approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and the commissioner. This plan has been carried out under my advice and is now functioning. It has been inspected by most of the officials and advisers of the War Risk Bureau and has had their approval. I am attaching hereto a copy of the report outlining the plan.

Mr. Eugene T. Lies, who had been deputy commissioner at the time I first came to Washington, resigned as of July 31, 1918, leaving the position of deputy commissioner, in charge of the investigating section, vacant. During the summer and fall of 1918 this position was frequently offered to me, and I was urged to accept it. I declined to do so, on the ground that I did not feel able to give any more time to the service of the Government, and felt that I was doing all I could do in this advisory capacity. In the fall—to be specific, on November 6, 1918—I agreed to accept the position of deputy commissioner, in charge of the investigation section, on the distinct understanding that it would be for a short time only. My moving motive in accepting the appointment as deputy commissioner was the thought that I should at least for a time accept the responsibility for the organization, and the further feeling of pride in the organization which had been created. It had always been my intention to separate myself from the organization with the end of the year 1918, and the signing of the armistice accentuated this feeling. As the end of the year approached the new director was appointed, and I felt it my duty to remain in the organization until such time as he had had an opportunity to select my successor. Director Lindsey was informed soon after his being inducted into the office that I was one of the war workers who would remain but a short time, and I personally gave him this information at a later date.

The act of Congress creating the Bureau of War Risk Insurance provides that certain investigations and reinvestigations shall be made by the commissioner. The plan under which these investigations have been made is precisely the plan which has been used for more than 30 years by the life and casualty insurance companies, great and small. It is not an experiment nor is it original with me. It provides for reports in the main to be made by local field examiners, whose work is supervised by salaried field examiners, the latter, in addition to this work of supervising, to handle the more difficult class of investigations. The economy of this plan can not be questioned nor can its results. The section has handled a very large number of investigations at a fraction of the cost which would have been incurred had we attempted to have all our investigations made by salaried field examiners, even were it possible to organize such a staff.

The charge has been made that the investigation business of the War Risk Insurance Bureau has been turned over to the Hooper-Holmes Bureau. This is a ridiculous statement, and no person with any knowledge of the facts would make it. The immediate problem confronting the investigation section was to obtain a list of local field examiners who had had some experience in making investigations and who would be willing to make such investigations and reports to the section. Insurance companies, inspection agencies, bar associations, State boards of education, and other similar organizations were appealed to to furnish lists in various States. The difficulty was to obtain the names of people who would be willing to make such investigations and names of such persons were sought from every available source. The fee of \$1 for making these investigations which was offered by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance was not attractive in view of the amount of work entailed in making the investigations. Many people with previous experience in such work refused to make these reports for this fee, although, on the other hand, a considerable number offered to make reports without fee for patriotic motives. The Hooper-Holmes Bureau furnished its list of correspondents for five States at the urgent request of the gentlemen who were then taxed with the duty of perfecting a list of local field examiners. These same gentlemen urged that the Hooper-Holmes Bureau go further and furnish a complete list of its correspondents, but because of the amount of work entailed this was never done. At least one large inspection agency refused to furnish a list of its correspondents, because it did not wish to divulge its trade secret.



As the work of organization progressed and the section's needs at any given point became acute, it was my custom to suggest names of people at various points throughout the country who were asked to make these reports. Many of them accepted the assignment. Many others refused it. The section now has a list of approximately 110,000 persons through the country who have agreed to make these reports. Of these, approximately 60,000 are active. Possibly 1 per cent of these active local field examiners are persons whose names have been taken from the Hooper-Holmes lists. The other 99 per cent were taken from other lists and obtained in various other ways. The Hooper-Holmes, of course, has no interest whatsoever in the work done by these people. It simply furnished from its files names of people who made reports for it, and they were requested to make reports for the War Risk Bureau. I find, however, that at six points throughout the United States local field examiners have been used who are part of the Hooper-Holmes organization. The names of these men were suggested by me while acting in an advisory capacity and when some one was needed in their respective localities to handle the work. These men have, I am informed, handled the Bureau of War Risk inspections just as they would inspections which come to them from any insurance company, and should there be any profit in the handling of the business, that profit would accrue to the Hooper-Holmes Bureau. Likewise, should there be a loss in handling it, they would sustain the loss. Anyone familiar with the subject knows that there is no profit in handling these reports at \$1, and no inspection organization would undertake the work as a purely business proposition.

I have carefully refrained from having any business dealings with the Hooper-Holmes Bureau on behalf of the War Risk Bureau, Investigation Division, since I have been deputy commissioner, and there is much evidence in my files to substantiate this statement.

Mr. W. B. Efner, whose name was mentioned in the article read on the floor of the House by Congressman MANN, is taxed with method and personnel in this organization. Mr. D. A. Jones is superintendent of the Investigation Division. Neither of them has ever had any connection with the Hooper-Holmes Bureau. Our method of handling the payment of fees is such as to provide every possible safeguard for the Government, and I particularly desire that our entire plan be looked into carefully.

JOHN J. KING.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE,  
Washington, January 8, 1919.

#### MEMORANDUM.

Re Connection of D. A. Jones with the Investigation Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

In the month of January, 1918, I was offered a position with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance as insurance expert. I accepted this offer and reported for duty on February 11, 1918. I was at that time assigned to the Allotment and Allowance Division of the bureau and my connection with the bureau from February 11 to March 25 was in connection with the Allotment and Allowance Division. On many occasions during this time I conferred with the commissioner and the general counsel of the bureau with reference to making investigations. On the 25th of March I was assigned to make investigations by the commissioner. Mr. C. F. Nesbit. On April 1 the Investigation Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance was created. On April 5 I was assigned to this division as secretary or clerk to the head of the division. At that time no deputy commissioner was in charge, but on or about May 1 Mr. Eugene T. Lies was appointed deputy commissioner in charge of investigations and I remained during his connection with the bureau as administrative secretary of the Investigation Division.

The plan promulgated by the deputy commissioner, Mr. Lies, proved to be very expensive to the Government and other plans were discussed. Early in July the plan for investigation under which we are now operating was submitted and approved by the officials. The plan under which the investigations are being made, I understand, is the same plan used by many of the life and casualty companies and inspection companies; that is, the larger number of examinations are made by the local examiners, whose work is supervised or looked after by salaried field examiners, who, in addition, handle the more difficult classes of investigations.

On September 11 I was appointed superintendent of the Investigation Division by the commissioner, Mr. Nesbit, and at this time I am holding the same place. At that time the problem which confronted the Investigation Division was to obtain lists of local examiners who had had some experience in making investigations and who would be willing to make such reports at \$1 per report. Many organizations, such as the Bar Association, inspection agencies, insurance companies, and other organizations were appealed to to furnish lists in various States, which was done; but the difficulty we had was to obtain the names of people who would be willing to make such investigations at this nominal fee.

The names of such persons were sought from every available source. The fee of \$1 which was offered by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, as anyone knows, was not and is not attractive in view of the amount of work to be done in making such investigations. Many people with previous experience refused to make such inspections. I will state that a considerable number offered to make reports without the fee for patriotic motives, and we have had many reports from them not accepting the fee of \$1. I recall that we requested one large inspection agency to furnish a list of its correspondents and it refused, because it did not wish to divulge its lists of correspondents.

There are, approximately, about 110,000 persons throughout the country who have agreed to make reports for the bureau; of these about 60,000 are active, and not more than 1 per cent are persons whose names have been furnished from the Hooper-Holmes list; the others were taken from other lists and obtained in various ways. Our method of handling the payment of these fees is such that it provides every possible safeguard for the Government.

On January 2, 1919, there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter read by Mr. MANN, a Member of Congress, on the floor of the House of Representatives, in which I was branded as a member of the "clique who expected to get rich from the investigation section of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance," which statement also implied that I, as an employee of the Government and superintendent of the Investigation Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, was acting in collusion with Mr. King and Mr. Efner in such capacity. Mr. King being also an employee of the Government and vice president of the Hooper-Holmes bureau mentioned, to forward the interests of that company at the expense of the Government and in utter disregard of my duty as a Government employee. I will state that I never knew

the Hooper-Holmes bureau or Mr. King, nor have I had any communication or connection with him or the Hooper-Holmes bureau prior to the time Mr. King became connected with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Investigation Division. The statement is not true that the investigations of Bureau of War Risk Insurance matters have been turned over to the Hooper-Holmes bureau. The work is being carried on through our own organization. We have handled 253,145 investigations, and of this number we have placed 7,358 with local examiners in six cities—whom I am now informed are the managers in their respective cities of the Hooper-Holmes bureau—and their reports are among the best received by us. It was and still is difficult to obtain men to handle this work properly in large cities.

As an employee of the Government and as superintendent of the Investigation Division of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance as above stated, I positively state that the charges contained in the letter referred to, in so far as they relate to me, are absolutely and unqualifiedly false.

D. A. JONES.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a minute right here.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the gentleman one minute, but I am yielding it out of my own time.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to know what business it could possibly be of anyone in this bureau, even if the Government was going to pay the allowance to these mothers throughout the country, if a mother has a boy in the Army and he is making his mother an allotment of one-half of his pay, whether that mother is a moral woman or a good woman. She has furnished a boy to the Army, and this boy has given \$15 of his pay. If she has given this boy to the service of his country, why is not she entitled to receive \$10 allowance per month from the Government? Anyhow, why should they leave it to my judgment or the opinion of anyone as to whether the mother is moral or immoral? When they refer this case to me, am I to pass upon the morality of this woman? Should any person be clothed with the power to pass judgment upon the character of mothers with sons who are in France? Is it to be left to the judgment of anyone whether these women have at all times lived the proper kind of life or not? I think it is an outrage, I think it is a disgrace, that when our boys are fighting in France for the Government to send emissaries over this country attempting to connect the name of the mother with some scandal. I charge that in every such instance this bureau has been engaged in an attempt to prove the mothers of these boys in France immoral women [applause], with the hope of escaping payment of a paltry allowance. [Applause.]

This is the crowning infamy of a department of this Government that has proven itself infamous in the extreme. This wholly inefficient branch of the War Department has by its inefficiency and reckless disregard of the law caused countless thousands of dependents of our brave boys to suffer because of a lack of the necessities of life.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Nineteen minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, there is a feature of this legislation to which I wish to invite the attention of the House in the two minutes I have. I wish to refer to the way the committees are assigned their duties. It is clear to me that much of the work of these committees can be assigned, even under the rules, to other committees in such a way that they will all be working committees, and people could not come in here complaining that they are getting a clerk without any reason. I know that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is getting lots of legislation that could, to say the least, go somewhere else. That is true of the Judiciary Committee and others. I am inclined to think that that is true of the Appropriations Committee. It is not the purpose of Congress to make two or three big committees work day and night and never really getting done. It is better if we could have it so that every man in this House might be on a working committee and each committee have something to do all the time. And there should be, in my judgment, such a reassignment and redistribution of these bills as to make that possible. Just specifically, I notice now that this bill provides no clerk for the Woman Suffrage Committee. To my personal knowledge there are 11 committees that have clerks here that do not do as much work as the Woman Suffrage Committee. I am on two committees myself neither one of which does as much work as the Woman Suffrage Committee, though both have done a good deal—one much work. Now, I believe you could do much good in this House by having a committee to reexamine the rules and their application to these committees so as to assign the bills in such a way as to make every committee a working committee. If it is not going to be a working committee it might just as well be disposed of; and if it is going to be a working committee it ought to have a



clerk, and it ought to be allowed to do something and compelled to do something.

The larger the number of Members who take an active part in shaping legislation the better the Congress. I know of many bills sent to what are known as the big committees which, under the rules reasonably interpreted, could be sent to committees which are not doing one-third the work they could just as well do. Yet we see these big committees actually clamoring for possession of bills over which they have, under the rules, absolutely no jurisdiction whatever. As far as the rules allow, this legislation should be distributed so that all committees would have something to do. This would give the big committees better opportunity to do thorough work. All proffered legislation would then come on the floor in better shape. Every man would then have a chance to do active personal work. As it is, some men crowd others off the floor all the time. This Congress is intended to be a representative body, representative of all the people. What is the use of having 435 Members if 30 or 40 of them on a few committees have charge of the preparation of all important legislation and there is no sense for such a theory? In my judgment, there ought to be a committee in this House to plan a better distribution of the bills introduced. The Committee on Rules perhaps ought to frame a different rule governing that proposition. Possibly the Speaker could get time, with the assistance of a small committee, to consider every bill introduced and determine where it should go. Certainly something should be done to put the burdens on more shoulders to relieve the overworked committees and to establish an equality of work and a balance of power among the committees of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion in regard to the shortcomings of the War Risk Insurance Bureau. After the act of November, 1917, got into operation I started out perhaps with as many war-risk cases as anybody in the House. West Point is in my district, and the war-risk insurance act particularly benefits the old sergeants and old enlisted men in the Regular Army, who had been and generally have continued living with their families at the old Army posts. With them it came as an increase of pay, practically. They were living on the old Army pay, which the war nearly doubled, and they started in and assigned half of their pay to their wives, and the War Risk Bureau added the family allowance, in many cases after a most exasperating delay.

As a matter of fact 150 cases came down here from West Point alone, and the War Risk Insurance Bureau proceeded to lose the papers of 50 of those cases. [Laughter.] Fortunately they had all been made out in duplicate and made out in the proper form at the quartermaster's office at the academy. The duplicates were sent down, and the War Risk Insurance Bureau promptly proceeded to lose 25 of those. [Laughter.] It took my secretary and myself several months to get them all straightened out, although they were perfectly simple cases, and there was really no question about them. In one of these cases my secretary finally followed the papers from one section of the bureau to another until he saw the check made out at the disbursing office and put it in the mail.

The real trouble about the administration of the war-risk insurance business, however, chiefly is the law itself. This Congress had no business to pass such an act as that. The bill was concocted in secret sessions by Judge Mack and a coterie of highbrows, whose attitude was that they knew everything and that Members of Congress are a bunch of boobs, who know nothing. They pulled Mr. Gompers in and railroaded the bill through under the guise of a labor measure. Judge Mack sat up there in the gallery and sent down notes to Mr. RAYBURN and members of the committee which had the bill in charge, practically commanding them that they should not allow such and such amendments to go through.

That act was designed with Mack-Ivelliian ingenuity to produce confusion and distress. Allotments of soldiers' and sailors' pay are nothing new and neither is there anything new about compensation, except the name.

Allotments have been handled for years by the Quartermaster's Department of the Army and the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Navy, and they could have kept on handling

them without any serious trouble; and if family allowances were to be added these two bureaus of the War and Navy Departments could easily have been expanded to take care of them. In fact they did keep on handling some of the allotments without family allowances, and finally had to take them all over to help out the War Risk Bureau, though the taking over was the cause of much additional and unnecessary confusion and some distress.

The compensation or pensions should certainly have been given to the Pension Bureau, and nothing but unwarranted Democratic prejudice against the old soldiers and the Pension Bureau itself prevented that from being done. The insurance feature probably should have been given to the Pension Bureau also, but if given to the War Risk Bureau it was the only thing that should have been put on that little bit of a 2 per cent bureau that was organized originally simply to insure ships. Why you should have put the enormous business of allotments and compensation and insurance on a little bureau in the Treasury Department created simply to insure ships was a mystery to me. The bureau was bound to break down under the load. No power on earth and no amount of "efficiency" in management could have saved it. Congress ought to have had sense enough to throw that bill out and pass a bill that was properly drawn. I believe at the time I was the only Member on this side of the House who voted against the passage of that bill. [Applause.] Now there seem to be a lot of Members who wish they had also so voted.

Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish in any way to supplement the exhaustive presentation of this measure made by the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee], but I wish to make a few general observations.

It has been suggested that four years after the conclusion of the present war the cost for maintaining our Government would be in the neighborhood of from \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 annually. At the beginning of the war the cost was in the neighborhood, as you all know, of \$1,000,000,000. We have in the bill presented to you—the first appropriation bill after the signing of the armistice—which reflects, in a way, the war activities of the Government and the expectation of larger increases of appropriation occasioned by our entrance into the war.

This bill carries a total appropriation of \$96,000,000. The last legislative appropriation bill carried \$37,000,000. The \$96,000,000 must be credited with \$13,000,000 provided for the taking of the census. Fifteen million dollars is the amount carried, but we usually appropriate \$2,000,000 for that bureau. But outside of that instance I do not recall any increase that is not directly traceable to the war. For instance, the appropriation for the State Department: In 1917 we appropriated on the statutory roll \$321,000 and \$126,000 additional for temporary employees, or a total of \$447,000. This bill, for statutory employees in the State Department, carries a total of \$529,000 and \$125,000 additional for temporary employees, or a total of \$654,000.

However, you may take other items in this bill—for instance, the appropriation for the Comptroller of the Treasury: For the fiscal year 1917 we appropriated \$73,000, and this bill carries \$157,000. Take the Treasurer's office: In 1917, \$325,000; in this bill, \$778,000. Take Internal Revenue: For the clerical force in that bureau, \$381,000 for the fiscal year 1919, and for the coming fiscal year, \$687,000. That is not the amount that we appropriate for services in the field for collecting the revenue, which aggregates the large amount of \$21,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. This is only for this city?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. That is only for the clerks in the bureau here in Washington. So that we have here incontrovertible testimony that by reason of our entrance into the war the expenses of the Government are going to be at least twofold, and maybe threefold, as the immediate necessities follow.

The subcommittee has had great difficulty in readjusting the clerical force of the War Department and the Navy Department to the conditions that will obtain during the next fiscal year. As was stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the Navy Department has resorted to naval reservists in large numbers to perform clerical services, and it was represented by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Roosevelt, when called before our committee, that it was the policy and intention of the Navy Department to go before the Committee on Naval Affairs and ask for authorization to provide for 2,500 reservists during the next fiscal year.

I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that that practice is open to criticism. Though the War Department used

limited-service men in a clerical capacity, it is not the intention of the War Department during the next fiscal year to use limited-service men at all, but to dismiss as rapidly as possible during the remaining months of the present fiscal year these limited-service men who have been performing clerical services.

Mr. TILSON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to submit to a brief interruption.

Mr. TILSON. Did it appear before the gentleman's committee what is the relative cost of a reservist and a civilian employee to do the same work?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am able to give the gentleman that information. There are three classes of reservists. A chief yeoman or yeowoman receives \$1,600, a first-class yeoman \$1,344, a second-class yeoman \$1,296, a third-class yeoman \$1,244, and a landsman \$1,123, all salaries higher than are usually paid for clerical services of this character.

I recognize that there was need for the Navy Department to call to the service all who could perform clerical work; but now that the war is over I can not agree with the department, particularly as we are providing for conditions beginning July 1 next, that there is any need for retaining in the Navy Department persons garbed as yeomen or yeowomen, right beside others dressed in civilian clothes, when we can get adequate numbers of clerks right here in the District of Columbia who are only too desirous of being transferred from other departments of the Government. Instance after instance has been called to our attention of young ladies who came to Washington to do their patriotic duty in aid of the Government by performing clerical duties who are now receiving \$1,200 or \$1,400, who are only too willing to accept service at \$1,000 a year, for whom positions are not available, and yet the Navy Department is going to continue, or is asking authorization to continue, this large number, 2,572 reservists, during the coming fiscal year. Naturally we had to proceed with that as a basis in our report of appropriations; but we did provide for temporary employees distributed over various bureaus, segregating the amounts, a total of \$1,040,000.

Mr. TILSON. Then the gentleman's very full answer, if stated in condensed form, would be that it costs more for the reservists than it would for civilian employees—that we are paying reservists very much more, on an average, than we pay the civilian clerks alongside of them?

Mr. STAFFORD. We are not paying so very much more, but we are paying them more; but it is a censurable practice to retain in a civilian capacity, when the war is over, persons under naval classification to perform clerical work, and there is no reason whatsoever why the Navy Department should ask it when there are adequate clerks in the District who are only too willing to perform that work, and, furthermore, when the committee were willing to grant them the money if they would only make the request.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know whether they are privileged to make allotments and the Government makes allowances to their families in addition to their pay?

Mr. STAFFORD. Although there is no direct testimony on that score, in my opinion this amount does not include their allowances. If they occupy a military position, either with the Navy or War Department, though they may be performing only clerical service, just like the limited-service men, they would be entitled to allowances to their families just like men in the ranks.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I think the gentleman is in error. I think the amount includes allotments for subsistence and also for quarters.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not the question the gentleman from Connecticut asked me.

Mr. TILSON. I referred to the allowances to their families.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not make the statement that the gentleman from Idaho seeks to put in my mouth. The gentleman from Connecticut asked me whether this included allowances to families under the war-risk insurance law. I say that they are entitled to the allowances. As far as clothing and subsistence and quarters are concerned, the testimony before the committee confirms the statement made by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. They would be entitled to the allowances allowed them by law.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I have been informed that a great many of the young women were encouraged by the War Department to enlist in this service for three years at these fixed salaries. Now, does the gentleman know whether any of these young women are in this class? If they are, I would not think the department ought to dismiss them when it encouraged them to enlist for three years.

Mr. STAFFORD. That phase of the subject was not gone into whatsoever. As every Member knows, this bill of 150 pages is the most detailed appropriation bill that is presented to the House for consideration. It carries special provision for 19,431 statutory clerks. It has been a laborious work to sit and go over these respective items seriatim, which the committee has been engaged on since two weeks before the regular convening of this session, until a week ago. But there are some features of this bill that take us out of the realm of tedium into the realm of practical affairs, and one of these is the growing importance, by reason of the termination of the war, of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in the Department of Commerce. We all recognize the great necessity at the present time of developing, so far as opportunity is offered, the European, Asiatic, and other foreign fields for our foreign commerce. We have in times past made provision for commercial attachés and commercial agents for that character of work throughout the world, carrying a total in the bill for the present year of \$400,000. The committee, recognizing the need of additional force to develop this work, which is so necessary at the present time, increased one appropriation for this field investigation from \$125,000 to \$325,000 and increased the total appropriation to \$690,000.

There is no denying that if we are going to increase our commerce, if we are going to provide commerce for our merchant marine that is fast being launched, it is absolutely necessary for us to aid as far as we can the manufacturers of this country to gain foreign markets.

The State Department has performed some activities along this line through the Consular Service, but the service performed by the commercial agents and the commercial attachés is separate and distinct and independent of the work performed by the consular representatives connected with the State Department. These men travel throughout the foreign countries to determine what business is available for the manufacturing and industrial interests of this country, and the department is equipped to convey that information directly to the various commercial and industrial activities of the country. I believe that the House will be almost unanimous, if not entirely, in approving this large increase of appropriation.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SNOOK. How many agents is it supposed to have?

Mr. STAFFORD. We increased one appropriation from \$125,000 to \$325,000, an increase of \$200,000. The salaries of these agents vary from \$4,000 to \$6,000, plus their per diem expenses when away from headquarters.

Mr. SNOOK. Are they civil-service employees?

Mr. STAFFORD. They are not, as I recall, but my recollection is not distinct in respect to that. I remember that that question was considered some six or eight years ago. They are not civil-service employees, but they have to stand a test which is given them by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce in order to have them qualify for the service.

This appropriation should have the cordial support of the manufacturing and commercial interests of the country. Through these agencies the prospects for trade expansion in foreign countries are brought home to our own tradespeople. Other foreign countries have similar trade agents. Should we now neglect this work, when the trade of foreign countries has been paralyzed largely by the war, we will pass by an opportunity that may never be so promisingly ours for years to come.

It is our duty to the industries of the country, it is our duty to our expanding merchant marine, it is of present moment to every section of the country that this commercial governmental aid should be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken.



Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 3, noes 99. So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of committees, as follows: Thirty clerks, at \$2,000 each; 30 assistant clerks, at \$1,200 each; 30 messengers, at \$1,200 each; in all, \$132,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so at this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that over on the other side of the Capitol every Member who is not a chairman of a committee, and who otherwise has plenty of help by reason of that fact, has \$4,400 a year to pay for his clerical help, and their work is not any more than ours. Since this war has come and the demobilization has brought down upon us an enormous correspondence, it is physically impossible for the clerks who can be hired for \$2,000 a year to attend to the business of the average Member of this House. While I do not propose to urge any point against the allowance for clerk hire for the Members of the Senate, I think it is only fair that we should at this time appropriate enough money under the proper item to pay the necessary clerical help for the Members of this House. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For driving, maintenance, and operation of an automobile for the Vice President, \$2,000.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do this for the purpose of correcting the statement which I just made. I made the statement that each Senator not a chairman of a committee was allowed \$4,400 a year to pay for clerical help. The chairman of the subcommittee informs me that more than that amount is allowed. How much are they actually allowed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I stated to the gentleman that each Senator now has a clerk who is paid out of the contingent fund, who receives \$1,200 a year. That would make \$5,600 a year.

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, \$5,600 instead of \$4,400.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the provision made by the Senate for these Senators who are not chairmen of committees, they are allowed one clerk at \$2,000, one assistant clerk at \$1,200, and in addition to that they have a messenger at \$1,200, so that the total clerical assistance is \$3,200.

Mr. CALDWELL. Then the chairman says that there is one other clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My reference was simply to the passage of a Senate resolution which provided for an additional clerk for each Senator, and that clerk was being paid out of the contingent fund. Just whether that is being done now I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. The chairman of the committee does not mean to convey the impression to the Members of the House that every Senator who is not a chairman of a committee is entitled to more than one clerk and one assistant clerk and one messenger, as provided in the last item on page 9?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is all they are entitled to under the law as passed by both Houses of Congress, but the Senate passed a resolution which provided for an additional clerk for each Senator, to be paid at the rate of \$1,200 per annum, the money to come out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Now, whether they still have that clerk I do not know, but such a resolution was passed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was the gentleman referring to the resolution passed by the Senate providing for those cases where the Senator had not been reelected and it was desired to continue the clerical force of the defeated Senator until the next regular or special session of the Congress?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No. The Senate has \$50,000 in their contingent fund, and that has been all they have had for their miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, certainly for the past four or five years. Now, under the current law the Senate raised their contingent fund from \$50,000 to \$140,000, the \$90,000, or most of it, to be for the payment of the additional fourth clerk for the Senators at the rate of \$1,200 a year. That is what I mean.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reading this provision it merely provides those Senators who are not chairmen of committees with two clerks and one messenger.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the fourth clerk, when there are only two clerks?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true, and the gentleman is clearly correct as far as the law is concerned; but I have just stated to the gentleman that at the last session of Congress the Senate passed a Senate resolution—not a joint or a concurrent resolution, but a Senate resolution—providing for an additional clerk for each Senator, to be paid at the rate of \$1,200 a year, and increased the contingent fund from \$50,000 to \$140,000 in order to take care of that extra clerk.

Mr. STAFFORD. Assuming that is the case, that would merely provide for three clerks instead of four.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it provides for four—three clerks and a messenger—making, in all, \$5,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman including the messenger as a clerk?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, he is used as a clerk. They do not have any messengers over there who is exclusively so used. I do not know of any Senator who is employing a man simply as a messenger at \$1,200. They are used to perform some kind of clerical service.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not acquainted with senatorial ways and I was seeking information.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. DALLINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman where is the provision for the Senate contingent fund to be large enough to take care of another clerk—where in this bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is on page 10, line 25. The gentleman will notice the House has put it back to \$50,000. I was speaking of the appropriation for the current year, which is \$140,000. Now, what the Senate will do when this bill goes over there I do not know—whether they will increase it to \$140,000 or leave it at \$50,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If they shall increase it to \$140,000 for the contingent fund of the Senate, the House conferees will yield and agree to it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They did so before; that has been the uniform practice in regard to appropriations relating exclusively to the organization of either House.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. MAPES. Was not the resolution to which the gentleman refers passed before this appropriation was made? If the gentleman will recall, some time in the last session Senator JONES of Washington, I think it was, made a campaign for an extra clerk for those Members of the Senate who were not chairmen of committees, and a resolution was then passed awaiting legislation of this kind which gave each Senator two clerks and a messenger. Is that resolution in force or will it be after this provision is enacted into law?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, I do not know, and I can not tell the gentleman whether it expired by limitation or not, but I do know a resolution providing for a fourth employee was passed and that \$40,000 of the \$140,000 was made immediately available covering the expenses of this additional employee.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill if the proposed commission to equalize, readjust, and reclassify salaries in the executive departments also embraces authority to equalize and readjust salaries of employees of the Senate and the House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it does not.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does not the gentleman think that question ought to be also considered in connection with the reclassification or investigation along the line of the readjustment of salaries in the executive departments?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hardly think so, because each House can take that up for itself, and with very little trouble adjust those salaries at any time it chooses. We have a Committee on Accounts, for instance, that considers resolutions in reference to salaries of employees of the House, and the Senate has a similar committee. There is no reason for a joint commission to pass on such questions.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, 35 or 40 years ago the two Houses of Congress got into a controversy in reference to the readjustment of the salaries of their employees. The House attempted to reduce the salaries of the Senate employees along with the reduction of the salaries of the House employees. The Senate opposed the proposition, and when the bill finally passed both Houses of Congress there was discrimination, the old salaries of the Senate remaining and the new or reduced salaries of the House remaining in the bill as it passed the House originally. Those inequalities have stood now for almost half a

century. Men at this end of the Capitol—faithful and efficient employees of the House—doing precisely the same character of work that corresponding officers of the Senate are doing, are receiving from \$250 a year to \$1,000 a year less. This bill carries appropriations for messengers in the Senate who are paid \$220 a year more than we are paying for assistant clerks to committees of the House.

The rate of pay or compensation in the Senate is not excessive or high. It is the same as it was 40 years ago, and yet during that period there has been an advance in the cost of living, especially in the city of Washington. And if we are going in this bill to do justice by the employees of every executive department of this Government, why can we not go a step further and right this inequality which has stood for many, many years? If we continue to leave that responsibility upon the Committee on Accounts another 40 years will pass without anything being done. I trust that when we reach the paragraph providing for a commission that we will do what is right and just by those who have been associated with us here in rendering faithful and efficient service and no longer permit this injustice to remain, which is a reflection upon our sense of fairness in dealing with these faithful and deserving employees of the House.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to ask the chairman a question. I notice the gentleman in charge of the bill made a remark that the Senate insisted upon some contingent feature here. I have not been here long enough to be entirely familiar with the procedure in a good many matters. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], Does the Committee on Appropriations when the Senate insists do just what they insist upon, or does this report represent an examination of these arrangements for Senate contingent funds and clerks, and the like, by the committee, so that the committee reports that these are necessary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was referring, I will state to the gentleman, to the amendment which the Senate adopted, increasing their contingent fund in the last bill. Of course, in conference the conferees of the respective Houses always endeavor to carry out the wishes of the House they represent.

Mr. LITTLE. There has been no conference yet.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We were referring altogether to the appropriation for the current year and not in this bill. When it comes to a question of the appropriation for the clerical help of either House it has never been the custom for the other House to offer any objection. In other words, each House, it is understood, will be the judge of just what it needs in the way of clerical assistance and supplies.

Mr. LITTLE. In other words, in discussing clerks and contingent funds you are simply satisfied that the Senate feels that those things are necessary for itself. For example—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have only allowed here for the Senate the appropriations that have been made from year to year. For instance, we have not recommended \$140,000 for their contingent fund. We simply recommended the amount that has always been carried. Now, whether the Senate will see fit to increase it or not, I do not know.

Mr. LITTLE. Does that mean that your committee recommends to this House for its approval the passage of these amounts for clerks?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The amounts carried in the bill.

Mr. LITTLE. Your committee feels it knows enough about it to direct this House to pass them?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely.

Mr. LITTLE. It does not depend entirely, then, upon the say-so of the Senate about it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am frank to say to the gentleman I do not know just how many clerks the Senate needs. I would not want to say that they did need the clerks or did not need them. We must necessarily depend upon the Senate to determine that, and they have indicated—

Mr. LITTLE. Have your researches ever determined whether they need any more than we do or not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I take it that a Senator, who represents an entire State, whereas we represent only portions of a State, needs a greater amount of clerical assistance than a Member of the House.

Mr. LITTLE. It was not my intention particularly to take issue on that. I was looking for the information from your experience. You think probably they do need a little more, then?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Would it appear to you they need twice as much?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That would depend, of course, upon the correspondence of each individual Member and also of the Senators. There might be cases where they do not need

twice as much and there might be cases where they needed more.

Mr. LITTLE. I was just seeking the information.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I will.

Mr. CALDWELL. There are some cases where there are two Senators in a State and one Member of Congress. In that case the Member of Congress would have as much work as both Senators. And there are some States where Senators live in rural sections and Congressmen in thickly settled sections, where the Congressman would have three times as much correspondence. I mean to say that neither of the Senators in my State has the correspondence that I have.

Mr. LITTLE. Do you not think that in a State where they have two Senators and one Representative the Representative should receive the same amount the two Senators receive? Would that suggestion receive the Senate's approval?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding \$1 per thousand, \$5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call attention to the misspelling of the word "pamphlet," on line 13, page 10. Without objection, it will be corrected.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

For clerk, \$3,000; inspector, under section 20 of the act approved January 12, 1895, \$2,000; stenographer, \$1,000; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, \$1,600; in all, \$7,600, one half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, with regard to this item here, I have wondered whether the Joint Committee on Printing could not, by the adoption of some rule or method, make some change in the printing of the roll calls. If the names on roll calls could be printed in distinctive type, that would be valuable not only to the present Congress, but valuable to students and persons who are investigating matters involved in roll calls after this Congress and other Congresses shall have passed away.

For instance, if one wants to know the political line up of parties and how the votes are recorded on a measure, it takes hours, and even days, to go back and look up the history of that vote to learn how the parties were divided. You must take not only the roll call at the beginning of the session, but oftentimes Members die and others are elected in their stead, and you must also take the biographical dictionary and find out to what party Members belong.

It seemed to me that if the names of Members could at all times be printed in distinctive type and that type carried not only through one Congress, but through all Congresses; that is, if the names of the Democratic Members could be differentiated, as now, in a roman type, and adopt it as a permanent thing and print the roll calls in the same way, and use italics for the Republican Members, then if persons who come after us or persons unacquainted with the Members wanted to look up the personal history on roll calls they could tell at a glance just how political parties and members of political parties voted on the roll calls.

It seems to me it would not cost a cent more to do it, but it would be of great advantage to anyone taking up the study of legislation in the Congress of the United States. I do not know whether any members of the Joint Committee on Printing are here. I do not know whether it is possible or not to do this; but it seems to me that something of that kind ought to be done.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. JUUL. I wish to state, for the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa and the Members here, that in Illinois the secretary of state carries on a publication in the form of a bluebook, containing a list of members of the House and of the Senate of Illinois, from the beginning of the State legislature, and each year you can get your copy of the bluebook when it is handed to you and there see the political complexion of each member.

Mr. GOOD. What I am talking about is the roll calls as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are not printed in distinctive type. It seems to me they might be printed in distinctive type, and that it would be a great convenience for people not familiar with the membership of Congress to know just exactly what their political affiliations were.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MANN. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] strikes me at first blush as a very good suggestion. The tally sheet, from which the roll call in the RECORD is made, is already printed in distinctive type. It has been the case, I think, for years, for the majority Members to be printed in roman and for the minority Members to be printed in italics and for independents to be printed in capital letters or by some other means of distinction, so that if the Government Printing Office would follow copy the distinction would be made in the roll call; that is, follow copy as to the kind of print. We frequently waste a great deal of time—many of us, I think—in going over old roll calls, and sometimes present roll calls, in figuring how Members vote. It is not very difficult as to the present roll calls, because most of us know the political complexion of the Members; but if you want to go back awhile, frequently in looking over an old roll call it is quite a job.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman means it is not difficult for a Member of the House to do it at present?

Mr. MANN. Yes; it is not difficult for a Member of the House to do it at present.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. But for an outsider it would be exceedingly difficult?

Mr. MANN. Yes. Of course probably the main reason why there is distinctive type used for the different political parties in the tally sheet is that it is for the benefit of the newspaper boys, so that they will not have to figure out what a man's politics is. It is right before them when they make up the list, and they frequently report how the House votes politically.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I am not a printer, but it seems to me it would be very difficult for the printers to print the RECORD in the manner suggested. Probably the same end would be accomplished by having a capital letter, indicating the party to which the Member belongs, placed beside the Member's name.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand why it will be difficult for the Government Printing Office to print one name in Roman and the next in italics.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I presume the RECORD is set up by machinery, by the linotype, and it would not be as easy to insert italics and capital letters as it would be to insert the letter "R" or the letter "D," as the case may be, after the names of Members.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The physical difficulties of printing, of course, might be easily overcome, but I believe that if the gentleman from Illinois will consider the question more thoroughly he will realize that there ought not to be in the official declaration of a vote recognition of political parties, to be put in by name. The physical difficulties could probably be overcome, but the objection is one more fundamental than that. The mere physical difficulty is not in the way. It ought not to be.

Mr. MANN. I could readily see that there might be an objection to having inserted at the end of the vote so many Democrats voted "aye" and so many voted "no" and so many Republicans voted "aye" and so many voted "no." I would not do that; but it is just as convenient for Members of the House and other people to have the roll call printed in such a way as to show the politics as it is at the Clerk's desk, where it is convenient for the clerks to have the tally sheet printed that way, so that they can tell whether a man is a Republican or a Democrat.

In other words, the reading clerk, in calling the roll, when he calls a name printed in roman will look over at that side of the House for a response, and when he calls a name printed in italics he will look over on this side of the House.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. A year or two ago did we not provide for a much more elaborate index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD than the one we have now—more of a topical index?

Mr. MANN. I do not think so. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD index is very much amplified now.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. We talked a good deal about it. I thought there was provision made, and that ex-Senator Peffer, of Kansas, was engaged on it under some provision that was made.

Mr. MANN. I think that did not apply to the current RECORD.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That applied to the old RECORD, indexing it by topics. When a man talked about free silver in 1896, or greenbacks in 1876, Senator Peffer would find that and index it.

Mr. MANN. I suppose it was mainly to give employment to somebody.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was called to the attention of some committee, I believe, a year ago that there was some person employed by the Senate to do that work, and that he was receiving a large fee for indexing the RECORD. I believe that person has since gone into the service of the Army, and that the RECORD is not being indexed accordingly at the present time.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

For compensation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates from Territories, the Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, and the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands, \$3,304,500.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to increase the compensation of Representatives and Senators from \$7,500 to \$10,000 per annum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not indicate where the amendment is to come in.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is the gentlemen's motion to strike out "\$3,304,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,400,000"?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania. I offer that as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania offers an amendment on page 12, line 5, to strike out the figures "\$3,304,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,400,000."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I reserve a point of order on that amendment. I will say to the gentleman that his amendment will not accomplish what he desires, because the law fixes the salaries of Members of Congress at \$7,500, and merely to increase the total of the appropriation would not increase the salaries. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Chaplain: For Chaplain, \$1,200, and \$600 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, in line 15, I move to strike out the figures "\$600" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$800," so as to increase the salary of the present Chaplain \$200.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DYER moves to amend, on page 12, line 15, by striking out the figures "\$600" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "\$800."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I reserve a point of order, if the gentleman wishes to discuss his amendment.

Mr. DYER. I do not think it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Suppose I make the point of order and let the gentleman discuss that.

Mr. DYER. I am quite sure it is not subject to a point of order. If the gentleman wants to make it, he may do so.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I make the point of order that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks, messengers, and janitors to the following committees: Accounts—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Agriculture—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Appropriations—clerk \$4,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, assistant clerk and stenographer \$2,500, assistant clerks—1 \$1,900, 1 \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Banking and Currency—clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Census—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Claims—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Coinage, Weights, and Measures—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; District of Columbia—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$720; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress—clerk \$2,000; Elections No. 1—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$1,000; Elections No. 2—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Elections No. 3—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Enrolled Bills—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Flood Control—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Foreign Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$720; Immigration and Naturalization—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Indian Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$720; Industrial Arts and Expositions—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Insular Affairs—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Interstate and Foreign Commerce—clerk \$2,500, additional clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,500, janitor \$1,000; Irrigation of Arid Lands—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Invalid Pensions—clerk \$2,500, stenographer \$2,190, assistant clerk \$2,000, janitor \$1,000; Judiciary—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,600, janitor \$720; Labor—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Library—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Merchant Marine and Fisheries—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Military Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,500, janitor \$1,000; Mines and Mining—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Naval Affairs—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,500, janitor \$1,000; Patents—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Pensions—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,000, janitor \$720; Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,400, janitor \$1,000; Printing—clerk

\$2,000, janitor \$1,000; Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Public Lands—clerk \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Revision of the Laws—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Rivers and Harbors—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,800, janitor \$1,000; Roads—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Rules—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; Territories—clerk \$2,000, janitor \$720; War Claims—clerk \$2,500, assistant clerk \$1,200, janitor \$720; Ways and Means—clerk \$3,000, assistant clerk and stenographer \$2,000, assistant clerk \$1,900, janitors—1 \$1,000, 1 \$720; in all, \$171,790.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee how it comes that the Foreign Affairs Committee, a very small committee, and the Indian Affairs Committee, another small committee, have assistant clerks at \$1,800, while the Naval Affairs Committee and the Post Office Committee and a lot of large committees here have clerks at \$1,500 or \$1,400? How does that happen?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know, unless the chairmen of those committees were a little more persuasive with the House. I will say to the gentleman that practically all of these clerks to committees have been allowed in the first instance by resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. I just wondered how it came, because there is not any comparison in the amount of work that has to be done by the clerks of these committees. Take the Post Office Committee, for example, with appropriations of about \$400,000,000 a year, compared with the Indian Affairs Committee with appropriations of \$17,000,000 a year, or the Foreign Affairs Committee with appropriations of \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 a year, and the Naval Committee with several billion dollars a year lately.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Probably the number of bills introduced and the number of meetings of the committee and hearings on bills before the committee would have more to do with the work of the clerk than the total sum carried in the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not think that helps the case any, because some of these big committees are constantly in session.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I doubt if there is a more active committee mentioned by the gentleman, outside of the Committee on Naval Affairs, than the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not disparage the importance of the work of the Indian Affairs Committee, but the volume of its work can not be compared with the volume of the work done by some other committees.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not in dollars and cents, but it does have important work to do.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not say it is not important; but the volume of its work can not amount to so much as that of some of these other committees.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Since I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I understand that has been the case heretofore, the Appropriations Committee has never recommended an additional clerk to a committee unless a resolution providing for it was first introduced and passed by the House. So I can not give the gentleman any information as to why these salaries are different. That is a matter that rests with the House.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will some gentleman in the Committee on Military Affairs tell us how many clerks that committee has?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, they have a clerk, an assistant clerk, and a messenger, called the janitor.

Mr. MANN. Of course, we carry a clerk and an assistant clerk in this bill, but I am under the impression that Congress has provided an additional clerk for the Committee on Military Affairs in a resolution, whose compensation is payable out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. CALDWELL. There are several people working up there. One of them is the chairman's secretary, who is allowed under another provision of the bill, and it may be that there is still another one, because the work is very, very heavy.

Mr. MANN. I am not sure, but I have it in my mind that an additional clerk was provided. Whether that still obtains I do not know. This bill carries one clerk at \$2,500 and an assistant clerk at \$1,500 and a janitor at \$1,000. The Committee on Military Affairs has been probably the most active committee of the House from the beginning of the session to the end, and is likely to be in the next Congress. I do not think we are making proper provision for that committee in this bill.

Mr. CALDWELL. I have not heard any particular complaint up there. Since I come to think, there are three men and two women working there all of the time. One of them is the clerk, one is the janitor, as he is called, and one is the assistant

clerk. Then one is Mr. DENT's secretary, allowed under the provision of the bill on page 19, as every one of us has a secretary allowed, and then there is another one, and I do not know just what her status is.

Mr. MANN. Of course, as suggested by my colleague, Mr. MADDEN, it would be ridiculous for Congress to say that the Committee on Military Affairs should have one assistant clerk at \$1,500 and the Committee on Foreign Affairs should have one assistant clerk at \$1,800, and I say that with the intention of making no reflection whatever upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. MADDEN. Or the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MANN. The Committee on Indian Affairs has a great deal of legislation outside of its appropriation bill. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is one of the important committees of the House, and I am making no reflection upon it at all. I think that committee ought to have an \$1,800 assistant clerk.

Mr. CALDWELL. I would not be at all surprised that a large amount of the work that is being done up in the Committee on Military Affairs is being done as it is in a great many of the other Members' rooms, paid for out of the pocket of the Member, instead of out of the Treasury of the United States, as it should be. I have no doubt in the world that the help up there ought to be increased, because the work is very heavy.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, it occurred to me that perhaps they need some one as clerk of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who is acquainted with some other language. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs needs no interpreter. The members of that committee speak all languages.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 25, after the figures "\$720" insert "Woman Suffrage, clerk, \$2,000; assistant, \$720."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. What is the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not authorized by law. It is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman informed us a few moments ago that they made up this list of clerks after resolutions had been introduced and passed on the floor. The resolution was introduced here this morning and passed with regard to a clerk, and if you follow the rule you laid down a few moments ago, now that that resolution has been adopted, then this bill is subject to the same amendments that you would make to it under your argument. I do not see anything in the point of order. If it is out of order I do not care to waste time discussing it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LITTLE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that every one of these assistants who have been added here is subject to the same point of order, having been added because of resolutions introduced, and they ought to be stricken out.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard upon that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not rule on such an omnibus point of order as that.

Mr. LITTLE. Then I shall make the point of order a little more definite, though I am not familiar enough with them to indicate which ones; but let us take, for example, the assistant clerk to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I do not know whether that is added by virtue of some resolution such as the gentleman from Tennessee mentioned, but I am going to assume that it is and make the point of order that it is out of order, because it was added, and if the gentleman says it was not, that would cover that point. Each of these assistants here was added because of some resolution like that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I can not speak positively as to every position here, but my impression is that practically all, if not all, of these positions have been provided by resolution.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And even if that were not true, the gentleman's point of order comes too late, because there has been discussion of the paragraph and amendments offered.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order. The chairman says that they are all that way in effect. If mine is out of order they all are.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman's point of order comes too late. The point of order is overruled, and the Clerk will read.



The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Doorkeeper: Doorkeeper, \$5,000; maintenance and repair of folding-room motor truck, \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary; special employee, \$1,500; superintendent of reporters' gallery, \$1,600; janitor, \$1,500; messengers—16 at \$1.180 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1.200 each; laborers—17 at \$720 each, 2 known as cloakroom men at \$840 each, 8 known as cloakroom men, 1 \$600 and \$120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, and 7 at \$600 each; 2 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$800 each; superintendent of folding room, \$2,500; foreman, \$1,800; 3 clerks, at \$1,600 each; messenger, \$1,200; janitor, \$720; laborer, \$720; 32 folders, at \$900 each; 2 drivers, at \$840 each; 2 chief pages, at \$1,500 each; 2 messengers in charge of telephones (one for the minority), at \$1,800 each; 2 assistant chief pages, at \$1,500 each; 44 pages, during the session, including 2 riding pages, 2 telephone pages, press-gallery page, and 10 pages for duty at the entrances to the Hall of the House, at \$2.50 per day each, \$23,430; superintendent of document room, \$2,900; assistant superintendent, \$2,100; clerk, \$1,700; assistant clerk \$1,600; assistants—seven at \$1,280 each, one \$1,100; janitor, \$920; messenger to press room, \$1,000; in all, \$161,750.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 17, in line 9, strike out the words "assistant chief pages" and insert in lieu thereof "assistants to messengers in charge of telephones, one for the minority."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is simply to make the appropriation conform with the resolution which was passed creating those two places.

Mr. LITTLE. May I inquire when this was passed?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can tell the gentleman in a few moments.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It was about October.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The resolution was agreed to September 24, 1918, and provided for those places in the language as appears in the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the employment of Joel Grayson in document room, \$2,150.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. I am desirous to know why this great big mass of gentlemen who are going to draw all this money on all these preceding cases are to be lost in obscurity while our distinguished and mutual friend, Joel Grayson, has to be mentioned by name in lines 18 and 19, where I find, "For the employment of Joel Grayson in document room, \$2,150." I have not the slightest doubt that Joel is a good fellow, but I want to know what Joel has done that he is distinctly specified ahead of all mankind.

Mr. MANN. I think I can give the gentleman the information.

Mr. JUUL. I do not do it sarcastically, but simply in order to find out.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, Joel Grayson knows more about public documents than any other man on earth. [Applause.]

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, that was exactly what I wanted to find out.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is true, and I think the gentleman himself must have known that. Here is the reason why his name is in here; I am perfectly willing to state it. It got to the point where the Republicans thought the Democrats would shortly win Congress, or, perhaps, after they knew they had won or were going to win, and it was the opinion on both sides of the House that Joel Grayson ought to be retained in the document room as a bureau of information and ought not to be left at the tender mercies of the superintendent of the document room or the doorkeeper, or even any committee that might be appointed to divide out the patronage, and both sides of the House unanimously agreed to put that provision in the bill, specifying him by name, and it was done. It is not subject to the point of order, and I hope he will be kept in the document room as long as he lives. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER. His case came up on attempt to discharge him at one time, and it was carried finally to the Comptroller of the Currency some years ago.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what his politics are.

Mr. FOSTER. I think he is a Republican, but he is one of the best men in the Capitol.

A MEMBER. He came from Virginia.

Mr. EAGLE. In reference to the gentleman's comment, I am glad to observe one public official somewhere in America who has at the same time the commendation of even a considerable portion of the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Let me add that this order or this procedure was adopted a great many years ago, not just a few years ago.

Mr. MANN. I remember when it was adopted, though I could not specify the date.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It must have been 20 years ago.

Mr. MANN. No; I do not think it was.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. His name was carried when I first came to Congress, and that has been 16 years ago. His name was carried in this bill.

Mr. MANN. I can not say just how long ago it was.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. My belief is that it has been carried in there for 20 years just because of his superior qualifications and fitness for that place.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield? He has been in long enough, so that he holds his place by right of prescription now?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. He holds it, although he is a Republican, under a Democratic House, has for the past eight years, and will hold it under the next House, not because he is a Republican, but he will hold it when the Republicans organize the House because of his efficiency.

Mr. EAGLE. Is my friend quite sure that if he were a good Democrat he would hold it?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, undoubtedly, because we have good Democrats in the organization who are particularly efficient and who have been held by the Republicans. I know one who held for 16 years when the Republicans were in control.

Mr. JUUL. I just wished to conclude my question. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if this sum of \$2,150 would be available for another man performing the same service in case anything should happen to Joel Grayson?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; it would not; it would lapse. The appropriation would lapse and remain in the Treasury, of course, if this man should resign or die.

Mr. JUUL. What would become of the office in the meantime?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It would be necessary for the House to make some provision, but this appropriation would not be available for anyone else.

The Clerk read as follows:

For minority employees authorized and named in the resolution of December 6, 1915: Special employee, \$1,800; special messenger and assistant pair clerk, \$1,800; two special messengers, at \$1,800 each; special chief page and pair clerk, \$1,800; in all, \$9,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to get the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] if I can. This paragraph provides for minority employees of the House and specifies those named in the resolution of December 6, 1915. Those were Republican minority employees. I am under the impression that in the next House the minority employees are likely to be selected by the Democratic side of the House, but there is no provision in this bill for their selection by the House or by the Democratic side of the House. We have usually carried in the bill an item providing that successors of these employees might be named by the House of Representatives at any time, and if that provision be carried in this bill, then it would authorize the Democratic caucus to have some one move a resolution that certain men be named to these places; but without that provision the places will become vacant unless the Republican minority employees fill them besides filling the majority employees' places.

Now, I do not want to be too magnanimous, but, on the other hand, I never did believe in taking candy from children. [Laughter.] It is that paragraph and the five following it. Heretofore we have carried, where it would come in after line 11, page 18, this language:

Successors to any of the employees provided in the preceding paragraph may be named by the House of Representatives at any time.

Now, why was that left out of the bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I was going to say to the gentleman that that provision has always been carried, and it was left out of this bill by the formal vote of the committee. I can not offer any reason for it, and I appreciate the force of what the gentleman says. I shall offer an amendment, when we reach the item, restoring it. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for calling the attention of the committee to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

To continue employment of the laborer authorized and named in the resolution of December 19, 1901, \$840.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is the place where the gentleman proposes to offer the amendment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Page 18, line 11, insert: "Successors to any of the employees provided for in the six preceding paragraphs may be named by the House of Representatives at any time."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the form of the language in the current law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Official reporters: Six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at \$5,000 each; assistant, \$2,500; six expert transcribers, at \$1,200 each; janitor, \$720; in all, \$40,420.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, if I may.

It seems that the Official Reporters of debates of the House are entitled to better consideration than they receive. If there ever was a corps of efficient men, trained in the art of their employment, it is this corps. It seems to me that while everybody who has devoted a lifetime to the study of an important calling, requiring expert knowledge and experience should be given the compensation which that knowledge and experience and their work justify, these men are not being paid what they should be paid. And I am rather at a loss to understand why the Committee on Appropriations has never thought proper to report an increased appropriation for their compensation.

I think the salaries of the official reporters of the House were fixed 30 or 40 years ago, when you could buy potatoes for 25 cents a bushel, sugar for 3 cents a pound, flour for \$4 a barrel, beefsteak for about 10 cents a pound, ham for 7 or 8 cents, and bacon for about 5 or 6 cents, while to-day the cost of these commodities has soared so high that it is only occasionally that a person can get an opportunity to indulge in the luxury of eating them.

I do not know whether it is in order or not, but I am going to test it out by trying. I move to amend the item for the compensation of the official reporters of the House by increasing that compensation to \$6,000 each where it now is reported at \$5,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves to amend, page 19, line 4, by striking out "\$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,000."

Mr. MADDEN. And I move to strike out "\$2,500" where it appears and make it "\$3,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 5, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "3,500."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very sorry.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say that I appreciate the force of what the gentleman says; but the Committee on Appropriations has never assumed authority and jurisdiction to bring in an increase of salary for employees of the House without the House having first taken action. I have understood there has been a resolution introduced, or is about to be introduced, in regard to the salaries of the reporters of debates in the House. That resolution will go to the Committee on Accounts, the proper committee for jurisdiction of it, and in that way the House can take such action as it sees fit. Since it is not authorized by law, I feel constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I appreciate the modesty of the gentleman from Tennessee and his committee in not having recommended action until the House has first acted; but since the House has had no opportunity to act, why should the committee object to giving it that opportunity now?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My genial friend from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] says the Committee on Appropriations never does any of these things without the consent of the House, but this very paragraph carries an item that the House has never authorized, namely:

Six expert transcribers, at \$1,200 each.

When did the House give authorization for that?

Mr. STAFFORD. In the gentleman's absence from Congress a resolution passed the House which provided that instead of the Official Reporters of debates paying the transcribers out of their own salaries and then being reimbursed later, the transcribers should be made annual clerks at \$1,200 a year.

Mr. MANN. All right. I was not aware of that fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the Chair to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee? I did not understand the ruling. I thought the Chair overruled it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained it. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for clerk hire, necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House and be subject to be removed at the will of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are appointed; and any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may appoint one or more clerks, who shall be placed on the roll as the clerk of such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointments.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. CALDWELL. If the gentleman please, if the gentleman is going to reserve a point of order on the paragraph, I would have him make it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order. It is legislation not authorized by law.

Mr. CALDWELL. Of course, the gentleman realizes that that knocks out all the clerk hire of all the Members?

Mr. STAFFORD. I intend to do as I did last year—offer an amendment providing for the same amount for clerk hire as is now provided by the present bill.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. That it is legislation not authorized by existing law.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What is legislation?

Mr. STAFFORD. Two thousand dollars.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Does the gentleman contend that it ought to be \$1,200, the law?

Mr. CALDWELL. The law is \$1,200. I understand that any Member who is not a chairman of a committee authorized by resolution to have a clerk is entitled to a session clerk at the rate of \$100 a month. That is the law, so that if the gentleman from Wisconsin insists on his point of order, nobody in this House will have a secretary or a clerk to take care of his business. I would like to have the Chair rule on the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Has any Member made a point of order on the paragraph?

Mr. CALDWELL. I will appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

On page 19, line 12, insert "Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: To pay each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for clerk hire necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, \$2,000 per annum, in monthly installments, \$880,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin whether this provision in his judgment is subject to a point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is, so far as the amount is concerned. The existing law allows the payment of only \$1,200. This authorizes the payment of \$2,000.

Mr. MANN. This is the same provision that was stricken out, but the point of order made against the bill is made to the provision in reference to the filing of the names of the clerks with the Clerk of the House, I take it?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is so.

Mr. MANN. This is subject to amendment, then, of course?

Mr. STAFFORD. It may be amended by any germane amendment. It increases the amount.

Mr. MANN. It increases the amount, but it possibly could not provide for a stenographer by name?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is perfectly correct.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to me for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not the floor, but I will yield.



Mr. HUMPHREYS. I understand the gentleman has an amendment pending and so has the floor. Would the gentleman permit an amendment fixing the amount at \$3,200, so that in addition to our secretary we would have a stenographer at \$1,200?

Mr. STAFFORD. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the subcommittee did not consider any increase of salary whatsoever for clerk hire. We had this matter thrashed out last year when an attempt was made to raise the allowance for clerk hire from \$2,000 to \$2,400. The motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL], was voted down at that time when the House decided that the clerk hire should be \$2,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. But the gentleman from Wisconsin realizes, with everybody else, that this work has been very largely increased, perhaps doubled, since then.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I can not agree to that so far as my own office work is concerned.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It has been very materially increased. My own has been doubled. I imagine that everybody's work has been radically increased; so much so that if you have only one clerk I dare say—I have not had the experience, because, being the chairman of a committee, I have more than that—but I do not believe any one clerk could well attend to the stenographic work in the committee and also perform the duties of secretary.

Now, it occurs to me that if we are able to have a secretary at \$2,000 he would do the work of the secretary, and then if we had enough to employ a stenographer to do the stenographic work it would certainly enable the Members of the House to perform their duties to their constituents much more efficiently and effectively. I hope the gentleman will not object to increasing the amount, making it \$3,200 instead of \$2,000. That would answer all practical purposes and it would not be extravagant.

Mr. STAFFORD. This matter should be presented to the Committee on Accounts in the proper way. The committee has not given any consideration to it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The committee has not given consideration to the \$2,000 which the gentleman proposes. The gentleman himself proposes to make the amount \$2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the existing law.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. In the last analysis it has to go back to the committee for final action.

I suppose the Committee on Accounts in the last analysis has got to come back to this committee for final action.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I offer the following amendment, on page 13.

Mr. MANN. There is no page 13 to this.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. To strike out the words "pay each," in the first line of the amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the words "for clerk hire for each"; and strike out the words "for clerk hire," in the last part of the second line and the first part of the third line, and add the following at the end of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee to the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee to the amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 19, line 13, after the word "delegate," strike out the words "pay each" and insert in lieu thereof "for clerk hire for each," and in lines 14 and 15 strike out the words "for clerk hire," and after the word "necessary," at the end of the amendment, insert:

"Provided, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners from and after July 1, 1919, shall be employees of the House of Representatives and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid: *Provided further*, That each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner may appoint a clerk or clerks, who shall be subject to be removed at the will of the person by whom they are appointed: *Provided further*, That the amount expended at the end of any month shall be carried forward and be available for expenditure in the succeeding month, but shall not be available beyond the end of the fiscal year: *Provided further*, That Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled, from the date of commencement of their respective terms, to make appointments and removals of clerks under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the employment of any clerk or clerks hereunder shall cease upon the death, resignation, removal, or termination of service of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they were appointed."

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order upon the amendment, as there seems to be a conspiracy between the two gentlemen.

Mr. STAFFORD. To show that there is no "conspiracy between the two gentlemen," I make the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say to the gentleman that I was very much surprised when the gentleman from Wisconsin made the point of order against this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. And the gentleman had a typewritten proposition ready to take its place.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I had this amendment in my pocket, which I proposed to offer, because I had understood that this question of clerk hire would come up.

Mr. MANN. I am not criticizing the gentleman. I knew he had the amendment in his pocket.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am firmly of the opinion that the House can not afford to increase its clerk hire unless it puts its clerks on the roll, as I have been contending for many years.

Mr. MANN. I am not opposed to the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The point of order of the gentleman from Wisconsin would simply have this result: Several years ago, I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] made a very earnest effort to put the clerks to Members on the roll. I remember in my first term in Congress he raised that issue, and I heard it fought out here upon the floor of the House and voted with him, and ever since that time I have been doing what I could in my feeble way to have the clerks to Members put upon the roll. Now, failing in his effort, as a matter of compromise there was inserted in the law a provision, not that Members' clerks should be put on the roll and paid directly out of the Treasury but that Members of Congress should file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives the names of their clerks, which amounted to nothing, except that clerks to Members had their names filed in the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Now, for what reason I do not know—but certainly I do not criticize him for it—the gentleman from Wisconsin has made a point of order which absolutely destroys that provision, and the result is that there will be no filing anywhere.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am employing an extra clerk who is employed in one of the departments of the Government. Would this provision interfere with my employing that clerk and his being carried on two rolls?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It would if he received over \$2,000. I will say that to the gentleman frankly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He would be getting over \$2,000 in the aggregate.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I think this would interfere with his employment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He is a very competent clerk, and I want him. He can do my work. He reaches my office after the departments close, and he works probably until midnight.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, and I say it in all sincerity and frankness and earnestness, I do not think this House can afford to stand in the position here of absolutely destroying the provision that requires the names of our clerks to be filed in the office of the Clerk of the House and then refuse to place our clerks upon the roll. [Applause.] And I for one am not going to stand before the country as being willing to agree to any such action. Of course, the House can take such action as it pleases.

Mr. MADDEN. I think every clerk ought to go on the roll and be paid by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think our clerks ought to be placed on the roll and be paid by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is what would be done if my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think it ought to be adopted, in fairness to the Members of the House and in fairness to every Member of the next Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman's amendment be adopted, would the gentleman object to increasing it to \$3,200? Certainly we need it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman that I am one of those who need more clerk hire than we have got, because I have had occasion to employ and have now employed two clerks, paying one of them out of my own pocket, though I hesitate to refer to myself. I have been doing that ever since I have been in Congress. I am not prepared to say to the gentleman, however, that I would support a proposition to increase the amount of clerk hire, even if my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman, if he thinks we need it, will not be very aggressive in his opposition, I take it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I certainly do not believe the gentleman from Mississippi would support a proposition to increase the \$2,000 amount without putting them on the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. No.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I, therefore, ask the gentleman if he favors my amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I am in favor of putting them on the rolls absolutely. What I would prefer to do would be to have two clerks, one at \$2,000 a year and one at \$1,200, both of them on the rolls, but what I ask the gentleman now is, if we accept his amendment, if his amendment is agreed to, would he not be willing to increase the amount to \$3,200? They would go on the roll then.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think clearly the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is subject to the point of order. I hope, however, that the House will meet the problem that is before it in a broad-minded way. For years complaint has been made in the House because of the large appropriations made for clerk hire in the other body and the small allowance in the House, and when this matter comes before the House with regard to our own clerk hire we side-step it. That is not the way to decide this question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman has stated that he thinks the amendment I offer is subject to the point of order. Just why?

Mr. GOOD. I think it is clearly legislation.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why, it is germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and that is subject to the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. I do not think it is germane at all, but I would like to see if we can not arrive at some definite agreement in respect to this matter, for the amendment has real merit.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not only germane, but, as some one suggests, it is a limitation providing how that money shall be expended and how it shall be paid out of the Treasury.

Mr. GOOD. It does more than that; and I will say to the gentleman that I do not object to it in the least. I think that the employees of Members, where the salaries are paid out of the Treasury of the United States, should have their names on the rolls and they should be paid directly, providing that provision is made for enough help. I call the gentleman's attention to a fact of which he has full knowledge, that Members by the hundred have said that if you put these employees on the rolls then Members will not be permitted, as they have been permitted in the past, to take three or four hundred dollars or five hundred dollars of the amount allowed for clerk hire and pay it to a dozen clerks at times to relieve congestion.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know that is the reason that has been assigned on the floor of the House in opposition to this amendment, but if the gentleman will read my amendment he will see that that is entirely taken care of.

Mr. GOOD. I have listened to the gentleman's amendment, and it is the same as last year, but it is impracticable of operation, unless he couples with it more help, which means more pay.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not the same as last year.

Mr. GOOD. I want to say to the gentleman, let us meet this proposition. Let us give to the Member a secretary, and let us give to the Member, at least during the session, a stenographer, and put them both on the rolls, just as they are in the Senate. Let us give ourselves at least enough clerical help so that we can do the business that our constituents expect of us. Many Members tell me that they are not able now to attend to the correspondence that is coming from mothers and fathers of boys over there unless they pay it out of their own pocket. Certainly this should not be, and I hope that we can come to some agreement now, as we ought to, to have our regular secretaries and then have at least a session clerk at, say \$100 a month—

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, make it annual.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say this to the gentleman, that if this amendment is adopted and the clerks of Members are placed on the rolls, so far as I am concerned I shall not make any point of order to any amendment that may be submitted to increase the number, but I do not say that I will vote for it.

I certainly will make the point of order, however, on any proposition which undertakes to increase the number unless they are placed on the rolls. I think the House ought to have an opportunity to pass on this matter fairly. It is a matter that appeals to one Member of the House as much as it does to another, and I am unwilling to stand here as one Member of the House and by resorting to a point of order prevent the House from carrying out its will in a matter that pertains to the House and its organization.

Mr. GOOD. I understand the gentleman, and I think he is entirely fair in the matter. I think he wants to do the things that a majority of the Members of the House want, and I would suggest that if along with his amendment he could tie up the other amendment to give the Members a stenographer as well, at least for the session, I do not believe there would be any opposition from any quarter in making a satisfactory disposal of the matter.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I will say this, that I am only waiting on this proposition to have it passed on, and then I am going to offer a further amendment to increase the amount.

Mr. GOOD. The difficulty about that is that it is subject to a point of order, and the point of order would likely be made and sustained.

Mr. CALDWELL. It can not be, because it will only be the amount.

Mr. GOOD. I should think the gentleman could get unanimous consent, and have them both pending at the same time, and then the point of order could be withdrawn.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, there has been some suggestion here that now would be the time to offer the amendment for an additional clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] offered an amendment to that amendment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserved the point of order on the amendment, if the Chair understands the situation. Does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] made the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I want to be heard. I do not know whether the Chair cares to hear me upon the point of order. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I made the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is clearly subject to a point of order—in other words, it is legislation upon an appropriation bill. No point of order has been made to it. Now, I think under the uniform ruling another amendment which is germane or which seeks to provide a limitation to that amendment is in order. Now, the amendment which I have offered I think is clearly germane, Mr. Chairman, to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, because it provides how this money which is sought to be appropriated by the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin shall be paid. The amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin provides for \$2,000 to each Member. My amendment provides for the manner of payment of this \$2,000, and it seems to me it is clearly in order. In my judgment it is clearly germane, for it relates to the subject matter of the amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this same proposition in almost the identical form was presented to the House when the last legislative bill was under consideration. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] then offered virtually this amendment to a similar amendment that I now offer and the Chair then held—and you will find the proceedings on pages 3057 to 3068 of the RECORD—that it was out of order. The provision that is now under consideration, to which no point of order has been made, provides for the payment to the Members of a certain amount of money for a certain specific purpose. The amendment offered by the chairman of the committee provides for the payment to some person, and specifies the way that payment shall be made. The amendment under consideration provides for an allowance of \$2,000 for clerk hire to be expended by the Member during the year in such portions as he determines. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee does not provide for any allowance to the Member for clerk hire. It absolutely negatives that idea, and provides for the payment to an outside person who shall be placed on the roll. This is no new proposition for the decision of the Chair. It was more exhaustively argued last year, and the sentiment of



the House then was, if I gauged the sentiment correctly, that the Members were not in favor of being deprived of the privilege of allotting \$2,000 for clerk hire during the year to such persons as the Members saw fit to pay.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. And the gentleman from New York, who has been so active in this matter, also offered an amendment to increase the allowance to \$2,400, and his amendment was then defeated.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield for just a minute?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not just at this moment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] two years ago, after his other larger amendment was eliminated, was as follows:

*Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House of Representatives, and shall be paid in the same manner as other employees of the House are paid.

What does the chairman say in passing upon the point of order and holding that it was not germane and not in order?

The Chair is advised by the Clerk that that is the portion of the amendment to which the point of order is directed. It seems to the Chair that this language makes a very definite change in existing law. The basic law does not impose any requirement of this character in regard to the clerks of the Members, or require that they shall be paid as other employees of the House are paid. It is true that this change in existing law is for the duration only of this act, but the principle involved is the same. The Chair does not think that so large an increase of illegality as this amendment proposes can be fairly said to be a perfecting amendment to the increase in the amount allowed by the basic law for clerk hire. If it could be fairly so construed then this amendment would be in order.

The Chair is of opinion that this, like the other amendment, is controlled by the principle heretofore announced and is not in order. The point of order is sustained.

I have before me the basic law authorizing the payment of an allowance to Members of the House, and while my provision is subject to the point of order because it increases that amount from \$1,200 to \$2,000 it can not be held it is open to amendments that are not relevant or germane. His amendment especially does not provide for an allowance to Members of the House, but it provides for the employment of some person who is to be placed on the roll. If this were in order, it would be in order to authorize a Member to appoint a messenger to aid him in the performance of his clerical duties. It would enable the gentleman, if this is in order, to say that each Member shall be allowed to appoint two clerks or three clerks and fix their salaries. I am unwilling, Mr. Chairman, that a provision should go through without any consideration by a committee. I am going out of Congress. This does not affect me. I am in sympathy with the suggestion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOON], and if it is the wish of this House that the clerks of the Members of this House should be put on the permanent roll and be given an assistant clerk—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, will the gentleman permit? Will the gentleman do this? The gentleman says he is going out of Congress and he will not be a Member of Congress. Will he not permit Members who are going to be Members of the next Congress to make the point of order if they desire?

Mr. STAFFORD. Because this matter was thrashed out over a year ago and the gentleman was as insistent as he is to-day on imposing on the Members these provisions that were not sympathetically received by the Members of the House, I intend to exercise my rights as a Member.

There is a way, and the gentleman knows there is a way. He has had nearly 12 months to bring this provision in regular channels. He has not made any steps to do it. Why has not the gentleman, who should be safeguarding the interests of the Treasury in regard to this bill, gone before the Committee on Accounts and presented the matter? He will get a respectful hearing. But, no; he has not done that, and wishes now to present it on the spur of the moment.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that at every session, at every opportunity I have had, I have presented this matter and have always met the opposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Why has not the gentleman gone to the Committee on Accounts? Why has the gentleman been sleeping all this time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is making remarks not justified by the record.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman gone to the Committee on Accounts with the proposition? Answer that question.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Wisconsin is not discussing the point of order.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], which implies that I have not made every effort to put the clerk upon the roll, that there has not been, and I leave it to my colleagues upon this floor—

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withdraw any charge that implied insincerity. But the gentleman has not taken steps to place it in regular channels.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There has not been a Member of this House who has been more earnest in his efforts to see the clerks of Members placed on the roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman from Wisconsin has said that this is taking advantage of Members. I submit to the Chair that if the point of order is overruled then the Members of this House will have an opportunity to express themselves on it, and if a majority is opposed to placing clerks on the roll the amendment will not be adopted. But I am only anxious that this House shall have an opportunity to express itself.

Mr. MANN. There are a good many Members here who will not be in the next House, you know.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But they are not making points of order.

Mr. MANN. What is the difference?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The difference is this: That the majority settles it, but one man, even if the entire membership is for it, may defeat a proposition by making a point of order—

Mr. MANN. Any man on the floor, as long as he is here, has rights.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why do you not go to the Committee on Rules and ask for a rule, if you are so deeply interested?

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to make a point of order?

Mr. CALDWELL. I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request, if I may, and it is in order. I want to ask unanimous consent that there be considered in place of the amendments that have been suggested an amendment reading as follows:

To each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner for hire of one clerk at \$1,200 per annum, and for hire of such other assistants as may be necessarily employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, at not exceeding \$2,000 per annum; additional in monthly installments, so much as may be necessary.

And then to continue as the matter was contained in the bill as submitted to the House.

I ask that in all sincerity in the hope that that will pour oil on the troubled waters and everybody can be satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, be brief.

Mr. LITTLE. When I am done I will stop.

The point of order here is, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee is new legislation and therefore out of order. The gentleman from Tennessee comes to us, and this is his answer: He says it is germane and therefore it is in order. It may be germane, Mr. Chairman, but if it is new legislation it is not in order. The gentleman says it is a limitation upon the grant. It might be a limitation on the grant and still be new legislation, and it would be out of order. He might just as well say to us that it was made at the right time. We often hear the objection made that an amendment is not offered at the right time. He might just as well say that it was made at the right time and that therefore it is in order.

The trouble with his amendment is, Mr. Chairman, that it is new legislation. If I can have the attention of the Chair and can have order, I wish to assist the gentleman from Tennessee with the same information about parliamentary law he called my attention to. As I was saying when the attention of the Chair was called away, it is clear that this is new legislation. Therefore it is out of order. It is immaterial whether it is germane or not. That is the argument he makes for it. It is immaterial if it is a limitation, which is the argument he makes for it. Those are the only arguments that the gentleman makes for it. If this is new legislation, it is out of order. That was the point of order, and that is the point I insist on and ask the Chair to rule on.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOOD. I am not quite clear in regard to the wording of the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], but if the point of order should be withdrawn would it then be in order for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS], or any other Member, to move to strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,200," and is the amendment then in such shape that that would give each Member two clerks?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. I will answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, increasing the amount allowed to Members for clerk hire from \$1,200 to \$2,000, is clearly subject to a point of order. Under existing law they are authorized to receive \$1,200 per annum. But no objection and no point of order was made against that amendment, and in the opinion of the Chair an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] would be in order, to increase the amount carried in his amendment so far as that is concerned.

The precise question raised here and involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] was up when the legislative, executive, and judicial bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole last Congress. Then the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] was in the chair and ruled on an out-of-order amendment, the purport of which was the same as the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]. The Chair understands the rule to be that a paragraph or amendment which proposes legislation being permitted to remain in the bill may be perfected by a germane amendment (IV, 3260-3263, 3839-3844); but this does not permit an amendment which adds additional legislation (IV, 3836, 3837, 3862). The Chair sustains the point of order to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman, making it "\$3,200" instead of "\$2,000."

Mr. MADDEN. It increases the amount from \$2,000 to \$3,200?

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes. It strikes out "\$2,000" and inserts "\$3,200."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUMPHREYS: Page 19, line 16, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$3,200."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to that amendment, and I want to say why briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I said awhile ago, the House is in this position: You have had for a number of years a provision of law whereby each Member was required to file with the Clerk of the House the names of those employed by him, and I presume that every Member has complied with the law, and the names are now in the Clerk's office.

Now, by the action taken to-day you have stricken that from the law, so that there is no obligation of that kind resting upon a Member; and here you are met by a point of order to the amendment which I offered, which seeks to place Members' clerks upon the roll and have them paid directly out of the Treasury and not through the Members.

Now, I want to submit to you, gentlemen, under those circumstances, whether you can vote that \$3,200 shall be paid to you for clerical assistance. We talk about high expenses, about high taxes. Members are about to add more than \$500,000 to this bill. That money will be paid directly to the Members of the House for them to pay to their clerical assistants.

I submit, gentlemen of the House, in all sincerity and all earnestness, that you can not afford to adopt that amendment. For my part, I am not willing to vote this great increase at this time. And to you who feel so disposed I wish to emphasize the fact that you should not do so now, since the amendment which I offered, placing clerks on the roll to be paid directly out of the Treasury, rather than in the indirect way of having the money so provided first paid to the Member and by him to his clerks, was not accepted.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CALDWELL for the Stafford amendment: Page 19, after line 12, insert:

"To each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, for hire of one clerk at \$1,200 per annum, and for hire of such other assistants as may necessarily be employed by him in the discharge of his official and representative duties, at not exceeding \$2,000 per annum additional, in monthly installments, so much as may be necessary."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. This is offered as a substitute. That being true, the amendment which I offered has the preference, and will be voted on first, will it not?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be voted on first.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee reserves a point of order on the amendment. The gentleman from New York wishes to speak to his amendment?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I understood I was recognized.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is all right. I give way. The gentleman will be speaking for me.

Mr. MADDEN. Who is recognized, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from New York having given way.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, of course it is not popular to differ with the men who are anxious to get more compensation for clerk hire. I realize that; but there is an orderly way to provide for the payment of additional clerk hire if it is necessary, and that orderly way has not in this case been pursued. We have in the House a Committee on Accounts. The reports from that committee are privileged. They report all legislation affecting expenditures from the contingent fund of the House. And in order to provide for additional clerk hire, the case should be submitted to that committee before it is acted upon. I am not at all clear that we should even appropriate if the Committee on Accounts reported in favor of it. There are thousands of people employed throughout the United States in every calling who are unable to earn anything like the compensation that is being paid to the Members of this House for clerk hire, and before this bill is finished there will be demands for increased compensation by many Government employees. It must be evident to every man here that if the Congress votes to increase the compensation for clerk hire to its own Members, you will be barred from any argument against increased compensation from whatever source it may be demanded. You can not justify it without submitting to the demands of anybody who is on the Government pay roll anywhere for increased compensation. And if this increased compensation is voted, you have laid the foundation not only for the expenditure of \$500,000 which it involves, but you have laid the foundation for the expenditure of millions more to meet the demands from other sources.

Now the question is, Are we in the mood to conserve the Treasury of the United States, or are we willing to pillage the Treasury upon every demand made from any source in order that we may be able to accord ourselves additional compensation for clerk hire? I maintain that I have as much work in my office as any man on the floor of this House, and I am able to do that work for the compensation paid out of the Treasury of the United States. If I choose to employ from my private funds additional service in my office, that is my business.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Do you?

Mr. MADDEN. Whether I do or not, I maintain it is not the business of any Member here. The \$2,000 a year is all that should be paid for the clerical force of any Member of this House, and I say that at the risk of incurring the enmity of the Members who are desirous of receiving more. I think the time has come when we should stop and consider the voice of the people. We are already spending billions of dollars for other purposes. The Treasury is empty—worse than empty. It is \$13,000,000,000 worse than empty. We have men coming back from the battle front, out of employment. They will be glad to find employment at any price. Now, in God's name, if there is any money in the Treasury, save that money to meet the needs of the men who have fought to sustain the honor of the country and not give the membership of this House additional compensation for clerical hire.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is rather inconsistent. It was only a few moments ago that he was pleading very strongly to raise salaries of \$5,000. The gentleman says that he can take care of his work with the present \$2,000, and if he cares to spend more, that is his business. Of course, it is his business, and he has business enough so that he does not feel it.

In addition to that, I want to call attention to the fact that the substitute I propose does not increase a salary. It provides that the Members and Delegates in the next session of Congress may employ an additional clerk each, in order that they may do the work that will come to them from their respective districts, and that is all it does provide.



Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I want to ask the gentleman from New York if under his amendment a Member of Congress could not get \$3,200 whether he employed anybody or not?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes, if he wanted to steal it; but I do not believe there is any Member of this House who is so low that he would steal a single penny of the money appropriated for clerk hire, and every Member of this House, when he becomes a Member here and spends money for clerk hire, has to make a certificate to the effect that he has actually disbursed the money; and any man who makes such a certificate, if it is false, not only steals the money but he also violates another section of the criminal law in that he has made a false certificate.

Every Member of this House can go into the Clerk's office and find the certificates that he has made and that every other Member of this House has made during this whole Congress, showing that he has actually expended the \$2,000 appropriated up to date. If any one of them has stolen it, I for one will vote to expel him from the House and to call on the Attorney General of the United States to prosecute him and send him to the penitentiary. But I do not believe we have any such men. I am satisfied that the men who are honorable enough to receive the support of their constituencies throughout this country, whose rectitude of conduct has been such as to mark each one of them as one man out of 225,000 fit to be sent here to legislate for the people, are all of high enough integrity to be trusted that they will not steal a paltry \$2,000 a year in dribbles of a few dollars a month. [Applause.]

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. CALDWELL. Since I have been a Member of Congress every month I have been compelled to pay for clerk hire more money than has been assigned to me for that purpose; and if it is necessary that I pay part of it, I should much prefer to pay all than to pay half, because, if I pay all, the people in my district will know that I am paying all, and they will not unnecessarily burden me; but if I pay half, the people in my district think I am being paid for all and they will burden me just as heavily as their wishes require. It is not fair or conscionable. The Members of this House work just as hard as the Members of the other House. The Members of the other House each get more than \$5,000 a year to pay for this kind of work. The smaller States have two men to represent them in the other House, while there is only one here from the same small State.

The combined sum paid for clerical assistance to the two Senators is over \$10,000 a year, and they can hardly get along with it. Here the Member gets a paltry \$2,000 a year, and you compel men to go down in their pockets and pay this expense. It is not fair or honorable. Why do you do it? Because, forsooth, there happens to be some carping individual down in your district of whom you are afraid. You have not got nerve enough to go back to your people and say, "You sent me to Washington to do this work. I need assistance to do the clerical labor that comes to me because of your desires, and therefore I voted to pay for that additional labor."

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. AYRES. What objection has the gentleman to putting two clerks on the pay roll?

Mr. CALDWELL. None in the world.

Mr. AYRES. Why does not the gentleman's amendment call for that?

Mr. CALDWELL. Because it was ruled out of order. I shall vote for it if the gentleman can get it in here, but the proposition here and now is, Are we going to stultify ourselves and say to the people back home that we can not be trusted to perform the duty here, because, forsooth, some individual in our community will say that we tried to raise our salaries?

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I dislike to inject myself into this debate, but it seems to me that the House of Representatives every year belittles itself by bringing up this question of clerk hire and discussing it. It seems to me that the House should determine that question one way or the other and stop discussion of it. I am very much opposed to increasing the allowance for clerk hire and not putting the clerks on the rolls, but giving the money to the Members to disburse as they see fit. I can not see how anyone can object to placing their clerks on the roll and letting the Clerk of the House pay them. We all know that the membership of this House has been subjected to a great deal of criticism, whether justly or unjustly, in connection with the House insisting that

this money should be paid to the Members, to be disbursed as they see fit. Why should anyone object to the disbursing officer of the House paying this money? We are not entitled to it unless we pay it out, and under the law you can place as many clerks as you see fit on the roll, to be paid by the Clerk, to be removed at your pleasure. If you pass this amendment increasing this allowance of clerk hire to \$3,200, as the amendment now stands, you will not have to make any appointments to the Clerk of the House and you will subject yourselves to very adverse criticism. I do not believe the people of the United States will object to Members of Congress having whatever clerical assistance is necessary for them to attend to the people's business. They will not object to that, but it seems to me, if it is the opinion of this House that one clerk is not sufficient to attend to the work of the office, the intelligent and sensible thing to do is to bring in a bill; and, if it is necessary, you can get a rule from the Committee on Rules for its consideration, making it in order that each Member shall be entitled to appoint a secretary at whatever sum the House thinks fit, and that in addition thereto each Member shall be entitled to a stenographer at an annual salary, those clerks to be placed upon the rolls of the House, to be paid by the Clerk of the House, just as any other employee of the House is, subject to removal at the pleasure of the Member. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman prepare in some concrete form his suggestion, so that we will have an opportunity to vote on that as a substitute for what is now pending?

Mr. CRISP. I can not prepare an amendment carrying that into effect which would be in order under the rules without a special rule from the Committee on Rules. Further answering the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the gentleman from Georgia is not advocating any increase of clerk hire at all, but is satisfied and can get along, so far as he is concerned, under the present allowance, and the gentleman will add that he always indorses his check and hands it over to his secretary and would be delighted to have him on the roll and have the Clerk of the House pay him.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I would be delighted to have mine on the roll, too, if I could get him there.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, is all debate on this amendment exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL]?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order was reserved upon the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Then I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee insist upon the point of order?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some confusion about this proposition, and I ask unanimous consent that this particular paragraph may be passed over until the first thing in the morning and that we proceed with the reading of the bill for at least half an hour.

Mr. MADDEN. I shall not consent to that unless we rise at this time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I shall withdraw my request to pass over this paragraph. I have an agreement to stay here until 6.30.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My request is that we pass over this paragraph until to-morrow morning, and that we then proceed with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the consideration of this paragraph and pending amendments and points of order shall be passed over until to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Then I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about this amendment. As I understand it, as the matter now stands the vote will come on the \$1,200 proposition, and if agreed to that will practically make the compensation \$3,200 a year for each Member of the House, an increase of \$1,200?

The CHAIRMAN. That is as the Chair understands it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I crave the attention of the committee for five minutes. Oh, someone has talked about cowardice. So far as I am concerned, there is no cowardice about it, and in my vote touching this \$1,200 proposition, over the \$2,000, I shall take into consideration, without any cow-

ardice, whether or not we ought to do it at this time. Oh, yes; the Senate gets more pay for their clerks than we do. That is a smaller body—96—and we are 435.

My objection at this time to this proposition, and probably at any other time during my congressional life here until I cross over, is to the increase. The country is in an abnormal condition. The value of the dollar, it is true, has been cut in two since the commencement of the war; or, to put it another way, prices have doubled. There is a great cry for increase of pay. Now, when this war closes the value of money is to increase so far as its purchasing power is concerned and the cost of living is to decrease. Now, there is a great movement—I guess you are getting some letters from people, people who are forming combinations throughout the country for a further increase of salary. Why, some are striking for an increase of salary and pay all over the country, and in many cases where the salary and pay are much larger than the increase in the cost of living. Now, we have got to consider not our own convenience but we have to legislate for normal conditions, and I do not believe we ought to make the \$1,200 increase for ourselves [applause], because we will be estopped from refusing undue increase to others. Now, for that reason, if for no other, I am going to vote against this proposition.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. How much money does it cost the gentleman from Illinois to run his office a year?

Mr. CANNON. Two thousand dollars, no more and no less, and that is paid by the Government and certified. I get along fairly well. I have a pretty heavy mail, and I have got a good secretary. Oh, they say a lawyer makes \$50,000 a year, that a merchant and a broker makes \$100,000 a year, and we have got the excess-profits tax, we have got a large income tax, and when you get beyond a certain amount the Government takes 80 per cent of it. Well, we pay an income tax on our salaries if we do not have anything else. All that is true; but, mind you, since I have been in Congress the salary of Members of Congress has been increased from \$5,000 to \$7,500. The Forty-second Congress—March 5, 1871, to March 5, 1873—increased the annual pay of Members and Senators from \$5,000 to \$7,500 per annum.

The panic of 1873 came upon the country. The cost of living decreased. The severe criticism against the Members of Congress voting for the increase caused many Members to take the amount of the increase and donate the same—some to charity, some to orphan asylums, some to hospitals, some to the church, and some covered the amount into the Treasury of the United States, from which it came.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I would like about 2 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Those were pretty serious times. Now, this is true substantially, the prices that the farmer receive, the prices that the laborer receive, however much they may petition us and send "round robins dispatches," when the time comes that the price of products and of living ceases to be so high the wage will be decreased, and we have got to settle that, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. No cowardice has entered into my position about this matter. God knows I have told my district I am ready to quit any time. I am here substantially by unanimous consent and will be in the next Congress. That is all I desire to say, perhaps I have not said it very well, but I wanted to say that much. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, let us have that amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. HUMPHREYS) there were—ayes 60, yeas 45.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The committee again divided; and the tellers [Mr. HUMPHREYS and Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee] reported that there were—ayes 61, yeas 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. RUBEY. But I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman will permit me just a minute, I want to ask unanimous consent that the total be corrected to correspond with the amendment. I have not the total here, but I ask that the Clerk be authorized to correct the total.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RUBEY: Add to the amendment the following: "and Representatives and Delegates elect to Congress whose credentials in due form of law have been duly filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in accordance with the provisions of section 31 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be entitled to payment under this appropriation: *Provided*, That all clerks to Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners shall be placed on the roll of employees of the House and be subject to be removed at the will of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they are appointed; and any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may appoint one or more clerks, who shall be placed on the roll as the clerk of such Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner making such appointments."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment. I want to make it as odious as I can, so when we get a roll call—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 13, strike out the words "to pay" and insert the words "for clerk hire of," and then add at the end of the provision the following: "*Provided*, That no part thereof shall be paid to any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOOD: In the first line of the Stafford amendment strike out the words "to pay" and insert the words "for clerk hire of," and at the end of the Stafford amendment insert the words "*Provided*, That no part thereof shall be paid to any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to be a limitation on the appropriation, and under the rules would be in order.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not consider that as a limitation at all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALDWELL. But the Chair does.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want only a word on this amendment.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. GOOD. After I have spoken a word or two.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to vote additional clerk hire to Members, it is very clear to me that everyone of those clerks should be put on the rolls and not a Member of this House should be allowed to disburse a single penny of the amount that is voted for clerk hire. It is for clerk hire. It is not for the Members of this House—and it should go to the country as such—that it is to do the work that Members are called upon by our constituents to do. Some Members are differently situated from others. Some Members can pay secretaries fat salaries out of their own pocket and not feel it, but others have not enough to reach down in their pockets every month to pay out \$50 or \$100 for additional clerk hire. They can not do that, but their constituents are entitled to the same character of service as the constituents of the man who can afford to pay for additional clerk hire. The amendment which I have offered simply provides that no part of this shall be paid to the Member or Delegate or Resident Commissioner. What will be the effect? It will be paid to the secretary or the clerk. I can not support any proposition for additional clerk hire if it is to be paid directly to the Member.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no right to do that under this.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. I will.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Is the gentleman sure it is going to be paid to the clerk? I am just asking for the information.

Mr. GOOD. It will be paid to him directly. That is the object of the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to the amendment. Now, to begin with, Mr. Chairman, we



have already voted to increase the compensation from \$2,000 to \$3,200 for clerk hire to each Member and Delegate. Now, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], seeking to take the odium off the action, proposes that no part of the appropriation made shall be paid to Members of the House, but makes no provision whatever to pay it to the clerks. There is no provision here as to who shall have the authority to appoint the clerks; there is no provision here as to who shall have authority to appoint a secretary.

The time has come when we must call a halt upon this indiscriminate extravagance, for this is nothing more nor less than a species of extravagance and waste of public money. We passed the amendment in the Committee of the Whole, but we are going to have a roll call on it when we get into the House, and I doubt very much whether we will pass it when it gets there. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] The gentlemen are insisting on a vote. But I have the floor and I am entitled to respectful consideration, and I do not care how much these gentlemen who demand to take further money from the Treasury of the United States call out "Vote," I propose to be heard. I have as much right to be heard as they, and I have been recognized according to the orderly procedure of the committee. The mere fact that I object to the passage of an amendment proposed is no reason why I should be yelled off the floor.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I do not yield. I propose to be heard on this question. And I want to say to you men here to-day that you will not dare to go on record on a roll call when this question is called up before the House and when a roll call can be had. These men who voted for this, where their names are not recorded, will vote against it when their names are called and their action can be recorded. The people of the United States will not submit to this unjustifiable and extravagant waste of public funds under the present condition of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee and Mr. KEARNS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I wish to make a statement. I opposed the increase, but since that was adopted I am in favor of this amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that all debate is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can ask unanimous consent to proceed, but a motion to strike out the last two words is not in order at this particular stage.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, when on that amendment the roll is called to-morrow, or whenever it shall be called, I propose to vote for this increase, with the full belief and understanding that I represent a district that wants the work done here. The gentleman would seek to frighten us by this threat of public punishment if we vote for this amendment.

I am firmly of the belief that I represent a district in which no "short skate" lives. I am firmly of the belief that I represent a district that wants me to have sufficient clerical help to enable me to attend to its business here. The men and women of my district want me to have such help that when the mothers and fathers of the boys, some of them still in France, seek information and correct information about their boys I shall have the means at hand of getting this information for them. If I need two assistants they do not object. They want the facts about their boys. In these war times they know that our work is increased and they want us to have the necessary help.

I have heard Members speak against this increase of clerk hire who have said privately that they are now paying from \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year for running their own offices. If some man who may live in Chicago or New York or Philadelphia believes that it requires \$4,500 or \$5,000 to attend to the needs and the wants of his district I am thoroughly of the opinion that men who represent rural districts are just as much in need of that much money to run their offices, and the people of this country do not expect the Members of Congress to pay this extra money out of their pockets. It is Government or public work, and should be paid for as such. [Applause.]

There are a great many Members, I take it, on the floor of this House, representing districts of importance, who are not able to furnish \$2,500 additional money for clerk hire. What the public wants is efficiency. We are attending to the business of our constituents, and there is not a constituency in the United States but deserves that its inquiries shall be answered, and

promptly answered; that information which they seek shall be supplied to them; and I am firmly of the opinion that there is not a district in the United States that will not approve of such expenditure of public money as is necessary to provide that information. [Applause.]

This is not an increase of salary for our clerks. The amendment does not provide for an increase of anybody's compensation. It simply makes provision for more clerical help for Members of Congress. There is not a department of Government but has increased its office force many times since this war began. This war has more than doubled the office work of the membership of this House, and it is absolutely necessary that our office force be increased if we do the work that our constituents demand we do for them.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. Would not that be an amendment in the third degree, and not in order in the present parliamentary situation?

Mr. SNYDER. Then, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment increasing the amount to \$3,200 a year, and if there is any way possible to put the employees that are hired by each of the Members or Delegates at \$3,200 on the roll I am in favor of that.

I believe that my office has the average amount of business that each office has at the present time, and I think I have a secretary who is capable of doing as much work as any secretary that any of you may have. He has had a wonderfully long experience here. That man has not asked for my assistance, and I have not paid anything to anybody except him; but he is working 18 hours a day, including Sundays, and that is too much to ask of any man living.

I believe that the people of my district will be glad to have this measure enacted, so that we can have a sufficient amount of help to do the work that comes to our offices, and do it promptly and in time. Therefore I am not afraid to go before my people, and I am not afraid that I shall be looked upon as a coward when I stand here and say that I believe this amount should be increased so that, as I said a moment ago, we can give our constituents the attention to which they are entitled. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses: For wrapping paper, pasteboard, paste, twine, newspaper wrappers, and other necessary materials for folding, for use of Members, the Clerk's office, and folding room, not including envelopes, writing paper, and other paper and materials to be printed and furnished by the Public Printer, upon requisitions from the Clerk of the House, under provisions of the act approved January 12, 1895, \$10,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALEXANDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14078) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EVANS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. FARR, for one week, on account of illness in his family.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks—on the pending bill?

Mr. DENISON. No; on the subject I spoke on to-day.

The SPEAKER. On the subject upon which he spoke to-day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

## EULOGIES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN, OF ILLINOIS.

Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, March 2, be set aside for memorial services in honor of CHARLES MARTIN, deceased, who was a Member of the Sixty-fifth Congress from the State of Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman that the probabilities are that the House will be in session for the transaction of business on that day? The gentleman can take some other day and have it set aside.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can pick out a date to-night and report later.

## DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the bill (H. R. 14516) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and, with the accompanying report (No. 935), ordered to be printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves all points of order on the bill.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 16, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting complete set of General Rules and Regulations of the Steamboat-Inspection Service (H. Doc. No. 1690); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1691); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4957) to establish the Lafayette National Park in the State of Maine, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 932), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11219) providing for the appraisal and sale of the Gig Harbor abandoned military reservation in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 933), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8861) for the relief of Ivy L. Merrill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 934), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 14457) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boston, Mass., three German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14458) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Freehold, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14459) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Point Pleasant, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14460) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Island Heights, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 14461) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Madison, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14462) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Baxter, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14463) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Washington, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14464) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Van Buren, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14465) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Marion, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14466) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Searcy, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14467) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Boone, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14468) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Carroll, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14469) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Benton, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14470) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Newton, Ark., five German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 14471) to amend the public building act approved March 4, 1913, authorizing the acquisition of a suitable site for a public building at Olyphant, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 14472) regulating the honorable discharges or resignations of those who served their country in the Army and Navy during the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 14473) for the construction of a new power plant at the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14474) for the construction of a plate storage yard at the Boston Navy Yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 14475) providing for the reimbursement of the diplomatic and consular officers and agents of the United States in the countries recently at war, or in the war area, for the loss of personal belongings or other losses incurred consequent to war conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 14476) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Ligonier, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with a carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14477) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the borough of Greensburg, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 14478) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Stanberry, Mo., two



German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14479) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Excelsior Springs, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14480) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cameron, Mo., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14481) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Weldon, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 14482) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stroudsburg, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 14483) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Flushing, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14484) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mingo Junction, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14485) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rumford, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 14486) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Frankfort, county of Clinton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14487) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Noblesville, county of Hamilton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14488) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Covington, county of Fountain, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14489) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Delphi, county of Carroll, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14490) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crawfordsville, county of Montgomery, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14491) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Attica, county of Fountain, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14492) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lebanon, county of Boone, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14493) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tipton, county of Tipton, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14494) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kokomo, county of Howard, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14495) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Veedsburg, county of Fountain, State of Indiana, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 14496) extending to members of local and district boards, Government appeal agents, and members of medical and legal advisory boards and State and county councils of defense the thanks of Congress for their services rendered in the administration of the selective-service law; also authorizing the President to appoint by brevet commissions the members of such State, county, and district boards; also authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to cause to be struck and presented to each of such officials, in the name of Congress, an appropriate medal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 14497) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, by increasing the maximum of Federal aid in the construction of roads to \$15,000 per mile; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 14498) relieving honorably discharged officers and enlisted men from payment of premium on policies of war-risk insurance for a period of two

years from date of such discharge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 14499) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dawson, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 14500) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Massena, in the State of New York, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14501) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Erie, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 14502) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pittsfield, Mass., one German cannon or field gun with limber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14503) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holyoke, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14504) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of North Adams, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14505) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14506) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Adams, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14507) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: A bill (H. R. 14508) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 14509) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Hendrix College, Conway, Ark., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 14510) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Throop College of Technology, Pasadena, Cal., one captured German aeroplane for scientific purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14511) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to cities in California captured German cannon, fieldpieces, and war trophies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 14512) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Selma, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14513) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Anniston, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14514) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oxford, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14515) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Heflin, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 14516) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 386) providing for the construction of a post-office building at Bedford, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBBINS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 387) to investigate the purchase of auto trucks since the armistice was signed and the failure to pay and subsidize the men operating said trucks from Detroit to Baltimore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14517) granting a pension to Ira Fetterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRANTON: A bill (H. R. 14518) granting an increase of pension to James Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 14519) granting an increase of pension to John Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14520) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Shepherd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14521) granting an increase of pension to Belle Morrison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14522) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Hurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14523) granting an increase of pension to George W. Fleenor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14524) granting an increase of pension to John M. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14525) to correct the military record of Barneval Schwartz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14526) granting a pension to Mary Anne Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14527) for the relief of Andrew J. Esser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 14528) granting an increase of pension to Edward Nathan Marx; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 14529) granting a pension to Rita Shafges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 14530) granting a pension to Charles Francis Schaeffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14531) granting an increase of pension to Julia Ann Fyock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREW: Resolutions by National Automobile Chamber of Commerce, asking Congress to increase appropriations to aid extension of export trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FARR: Resolutions of Enterprise Lodge No. 21, Joseph Oliver, secretary, Loyal Knights of America, favoring deportation of interned enemy aliens, and urging that naturalized citizens whose conduct invoked the law because of alien sympathies and action be deprived of their citizenship and deported; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PAIGE: Memorial of Lithuanians of Gardner, Mass., relative to recognition of that people as an independent nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the American Federation of Labor, protesting against the zone system and increased rate on second-class matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by Farmers' National Conference on economic reconstruction in America and international reconstruction with reference to the natural resources of the country; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of Western Fremont County Council of Defense, urging legislation granting patent to next of kin of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines who had entered upon the public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNOOK: Petition of members of Federated Shop Crafts, of Van Wert, Ohio, favoring retention of the railroads under Government control for a period of five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 16, 1919.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, January 14, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

#### SENATOR FROM MISSISSIPPI.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of election of BYRON PATTON HARRISON as a Senator from the State of Mississippi for the term beginning March 4, 1919, which will be read and placed on the file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

#### STATE OF MISSISSIPPI.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, BYRON PATTON HARRISON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of

Mississippi a Senator from the said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Theodore G. Bilbo, and our seal hereto affixed at Jackson, Miss., this the 2d day of January, in the year of our Lord 1919.

THEODORE G. BILBO,  
Governor.

By the governor:  
[SEAL.]

JOSEPH W. POWELL,  
Secretary of State.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS (H. DOC. NO. 1693).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules and lists of useless papers, of no historical value in the Department of Commerce, and requesting action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House thereof.

EMPLOYEES IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. DOC. NO. 339).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of employees in the Department of Justice January 15, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

EMPLOYEES OF NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 341).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of employees in the department January 1, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

TRAVEL OF EMPLOYEES IN AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 1689).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail travel from Washington to points outside of the District of Columbia performed by officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ALASKAN ENGINEERING COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 1688).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of expenditures by the Alaskan Engineering Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed.

BOARD OF SUPERVISING INSPECTORS (H. DOC. NO. 1690).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, copy of regulations by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, approved by the Secretary of Commerce, and authorized by the so-called seamen's act, which with the accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EMPLOYEES IN UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 340).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of employees in the board January 14, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

FEDERAL BOARD OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION (S. DOC. NO. 343).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Director of the Federal Board of Vocational Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, an itemized account of expenditures of the board from October 1, 1918, to December 31, 1918, inclusive, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed.

COST OF THE WAR (S. DOC. NO. 342).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Food Administrator, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 15, 1918, certain information relative to the cost of the war so far as the Food Administration is concerned up to January 1, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.